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WOMEN LAW STUDENTS

There will be an important general meeting of the Women Law Students Assoc. today Friday, at noon in the women's lounge.

We need your input. Projects for this term will be discussed.

LAW OF THE SEA EXPERT TO HONOR PROF. BISHOP

Ambassador John R. Stevenson, Special Representative of the President for the Law of the Sea Conference and Chairman of the U.S. delegation, will speak on the topic "Law-making for the Oceans" at 12:45 p.m., Thursday, January 30, in the Lawyer's Club Lounge of the University of Michigan Law School. The lecture is the first in a series presented by the International Law Society and the Law School honoring Professor William W. Bishop, Jr., noted international law authority who will be retiring at the end of 1975.

Ambassador Stevenson, formerly Chief Legal Advisor to the Department of State, is the top American representative to the Law of the Sea Conference, the largest, broadest-ranging international conference ever held. In the first session of the Conference last summer, representatives from 150 nations met in Caracas to deal with such questions as pollution of the oceans, control over fishing and whaling, scientific research, and the mining of seabed minerals. The Conference also deals with international shipping, including the rights of military ships to pass through straits, and with setting the outer boundaries for national control over coastal waters. Dr. Stevenson announced last July that the U.S. position in the Conference would be support for a twelve mile territorial limit and a 200 mile zone where the coastal state would have primary responsibility to guard resources within the zone. The Conference reconvenes in Geneva in March 1975.

Ambassador Stevenson, in addition to his position as chief lawyer in the State Department, is past president of the American Society of International Law and a senior partner in the New York law firm of Sullivan and Cromwell.

For further information: Robert Wessely 764-8959

STAR TREK LIVES!

Gene Roddenberry - creator and producer of Star Trek - spoke to a capacity crowd of die-hard Trekkies in Hill Auditorium last Monday evening. Although much of his talk was on Star Trek and it's potential offspring, he also gave us a fascinating look into the corporate mentality that controls the boob tube today.

To keep a show on the air in prime time, it must capture an audience of at least 18 million people. The sole measure of a program's worth to the network is the size of this audience because that determines how much commercials can be sold for. The traditional ideals of art for art's sake, intellectual stimulation, and informational programs on vital topics simply do not exist in television today. The corporate mentality is what has given us programs like "Let's Make A Deal", it is what kept television from making a meaningful stand on the Vietnam war and many other of today's vital issues.

It is undeniably true that the networks ran thousands of feet of film showing (SEE ROOTREK P. 8)
LSSS unmasked

(Johnny Vinyard attended the LSSS meeting on Monday and had the following observations and comments).

I went to the Law School Student Senate meeting tonight and it was a lot of fun to watch, in addition to being somewhat informative. The following brief notes of the business considered along with my personal observations and comments are offered for the gratification of those among the readership who may wonder about the lever points of LSSS power and how they get pulled.

Legal Aid got LSSS authorization to make a bookkeeping transfer having something to do with purchasing law books for the Campus Branch.

The Black Law Student Association requested a LSSS subsidy for a ball for the purpose of raising money for the African Famine Relief. The event would be open to the entire Law School community. In fact, plans involve selling tickets at $10 per person (including dinner and dance). It was pointed out that BLSA's budget appropriation for the year included no funds for social activities. Final determination was delayed until the next LSSS meeting in accordance with LSSS budget policy relating to requests by outside groups.

The LSSS ratified funding (which had been tentatively approved at the last meeting) for a Law School play. Confusion reigned momentarily as to the precise details of the play budget, because the treasurer was absent and the secretary had left the unpublished minutes of the last meeting at home. The figure was subsequently revealed to be $549. Admission will be on a law student free, non-law pay 50¢, basis with income going back into the Senate treasury.

The treasurer reported that his estimate of funds available but not appropriated this year will range from four to five thousand dollars. In addition, the current amount of cash on hand appears to be unexpectedly large for this time of year. The latter situation is apparently attributable to several factors: Michigan Inmate Assistance Program (MIAP) is ceasing operations and returning unused funds.

ELS grant

ELS PLANS FOR USE OF GRANT

The Environmental Law Society, a student group at The University of Michigan Law School, has been awarded a $7,644 "mini-grant" from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to assist Michigan communities with land-use decision making.

A major focus of the project, which begins this month, is the clarification of legal problems arising when local officials seek to halt or control new land development because of environmental considerations.

Across the nation, "controlled growth" proponents are receiving a legal challenge on two fronts, according to the U-M group.

First, developers claim they are entitled to compensation when they are not permitted to develop their land; and citizens have argued that growth restrictions infringe on their constitutional "right to travel," according to the U-M group.

U-M law Prof. Philip Soper, an environmental law specialist and adviser to the project, says recent court rulings have been inconsistent. Some courts have upheld land-use controls which restrict development, he says, while others have awarded verdicts to developers.

Soper also says conflicting approaches have developed over the "right to travel" issue.

"Last April, a lower federal court decision invalidated an attempt by the city of Petaluma in the San Francisco Bay area of California to control growth by restricting new housing development in the city. That decision is currently being appealed, with environmentalists supporting the city's position that the controlled growth plan is not unconstitutional," according to Soper.

As part of the U-M project, the Environmental Law Society plans to conduct a series of land-use workshops in selected Michigan towns and to produce a written manual explaining relevant legal issues. The U-M group now has a membership of about 25 law students.

(SEE ELS)
INTERVIEW I: "SLIGHTLY BENT"
BY STAN FORD

This in fact the first of hopefully many interviews with various law school personalities. As the few law people that I know are very critical of the law school experience it seems incumbent, if this series is to give a broad picture of the law school life, that anyone with something to say, desiring to be interviewed, drop a note in the RG office. Anonymity is guaranteed. Questions will be short and sweet. Hopefully we can touch all the corners: as kissing to academic excellence, fullblown psychosis to order someone's coif.

Larry X is a slim, scrawny, hardbitten Kentuckian with a fierce cigarette habit and a fiercer classroom demeanor. His friends call him an aggressive, capable Law Student and for little or no reason.

Q. Why did you come to Michigan law?

A. Like most of the other suckers here I applied to Harvard and Yale but a sudden dip in my law boards brought me here. Also the weather (laughter). Chicago seemed too academic and Stanford was too far away. Also the lure of Frank Allen and Yale Kamisar.

Q. Did you come out of an academic tradition?

A. Yes and surprisingly I miss it. I went to an old-snot Eastern school where the irrelevant was the rule. I miss it... the detachment...the sense of the universal. On the other hand I've gotten a buzz off the emphasis on facts here. It's like a complex monopoly game only on some bizarre sort of amphetamines.

Q. You show some familiarity with drugs?

A. Well the first time I went to Prof. X's Tax II stoned he looked like a pulsating hamburger. Didn't do my notes much good, so I haven't done it since. In class, I still get stoned on grass about once a week but the idea of tripping in Hutchins is a bit much for a delicate sort like myself.

Q. What about grades, and complaints?

A. No I get mostly A's, occasional anarchic C's, so I don't complain much. With thirty thousand law students being produced a year I think grades are needed to separate the top from the bottom of the class.

Q. Interviewing?

A. I like it. The law school does a good job of bringing folks here, although I think I'd like to see more non-corporate opportunities open up. Sometimes the interview itself is like a wonderful Japanese noh play. Posture you know. Posture.

Q. How do you feel about sex and the law school?

A. Well I tried it once on the ninth floor of the stacks. We started by the North Carolina Bar Review and ended up near the Pacific Reports. A bummer.

Q. I mean more generally.

A. I just got a natural trash mind. Hutchins will deaden the impulse of any young person. Sublimation. There's some football type jock faggotry, not actual, but in the air.

Q. How would you sum up your experience here?

A. Good, good, very good. It's been interesting, some fine Profs., learned how to use the tools.

Q. Any outstanding piece missing from your law school jigsaw puzzle?

A. I often wondered about the ambiguous position of The Blacks here at the law school. I mean it's weird enough for me. There doesn't seem to be an organized politic like when I was an undergraduate. Only in the outrage voiced in Welfare Law did I get a sense a real Black feeling toward the law school. Moby Dick all over again. Melville said white is the most frightening color you know.

I've also got some fears about jobs given the way the economy is going. I'd like to see profsors talk about that more...they just seem to meander about and hassle about ideas and stuff. Don't wanna starve and have to eat my copy of Trust and Estates. How about you?

(SEE FORD P. 10)
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FIND A HIDDEN MESSAGE?

1. According to law
2. A law class (abbr.)
3. Forbidden
4. A type of political fund
5. Frozen zone at pole
6. Undue delay
7. First term freshman grades
8. A long yellow fruit
9. Opposite of good
10. President of S. Korea
11. Room at the top of house
12. Hawaiian feast
13. ______ as a board

key:

8. A long yellow fruit
10. President of S. Korea
12. Hawaiian feast

*This is part of an "h. m."
FARMWORKERS

In the early 1960's, farmworkers began working together to form a union, a union which would have the strength and determination to be a strong voice for the workers in matters which directly affect them. That union was the United Farm Workers, AFL-CIO, lead by Cesar Chavez. In the United Farm Workers (UFW), farmworkers elect committees on each ranch to represent them in negotiations, enforce contracts on union ranches, and to conduct local union affairs. They also have a democratic voice in the election of the UFW national officers. Under the UFW's leadership, farmworkers launched a nationwide boycott of all California grapes from ranches where the growers had refused to agree to impartially supervised elections and contract negotiations. In 1970, after receiving wide public support across the country and around the world, 95% of the grape growers signed contracts with the UFW. Because of these contracts, wages and conditions improved dramatically, and for the first time, farmworkers enjoyed dignity and democracy on the job.

After the success of the grape workers, farmworkers on lettuce ranches in California and Arizona petitioned the growers for elections and UFW representation. The growers' response was to meet secretly with officials of the Teamsters Union, and to then sign "sweetheart" contracts with them to try to undercut the farmworkers' organizing efforts. The Teamsters' contracts were greatly inferior to all UFW agreements in the areas of pesticide protection, wages, hiring and working conditions. The Teamsters didn't even organize locals or ranch committees to enforce the contracts. Rather than accept this collusive deal, farmworkers walked out of the fields in what the Los Angeles Times called "the biggest strike in California agricultural history." It estimated that over 7,000 workers were on strike. The growers got local courts to issue injunctions against the strike, forcing farmworkers once again to appeal to people across the country for support in a boycott of non-UFW head lettuce.

(SEE UFW P. II)
placement

View from the Second Floor or (If one more person says, "What do you do all Spring"- I'll scream.)

Fall recruiting is over and admittedly things are much quieter on the second floor. Our job is far from over, though, as those of you who will be looking for a job this Spring know. We are here to help you find a job, to answer questions, or talk about what you might do next. In order to design effective methods of helping all of you, we need your cooperation. If all students who will be looking for a job this term will fill out the yellow questionnaire available outside Room 100 and in our office, we will know where we stand, & how we should proceed this term.

In past years students who were interested in non-traditional jobs or jobs with small firms have felt that the Placement Office could be of little use to them. Many haven't bothered to come visit or even check out the materials we do have available. If this office is to be helpful to all students, we need your cooperation.

PLEASE FILL OUT THE YELLOW FORM AND RETURN IT TO US AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

On February 10th and 11th there will be a film provided by the ABA about job-hunting in today's market.

Interviews Taking Place Next Week

Tuesday, January 28
Bauckham, Reed, Lang & Schaefer
Kalamazoo, Michigan - 3rd year students
Lincoln National Corporation
Fort Wayne, Indiana - 3rd year students

Wednesday, January 29
Foster, Lindemer, Swift and Collins
Lansing, Michigan - 2nd year students
Union Pacific Railroad Company
Omaha, Nebraska - 3rd year students

Thursday, January 30

Michigan Migrant Legal Assistance Project, Inc., Berrien Springs, Mich. 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students
Federal Trade Commission - Cleveland Office, Cleveland, Ohio - 3rd year students

Please stop by the Placement Office to sign up.
(ROD T R E K)

bombed-out villages and mutilated bodies during the Vietnam period. They produced an overkill numbing a segment of the American public by a constant repitition of the same events. At the same time, the networks adopted a rule prohibiting prime-time portrayals of this violence in other contexts. Dramatic programs with war-based settings - with identifiable characters - were passed. This was not because such programs were unpatriotic or un-American, but because such programs were "commercially bad." Sponsors could not be found to pay for such shows. As a result the American public began to think that the characters in "Gunsmoke" and "Marcus Welby" were real people, while the nameless bodies in the newsreels were "fiction." Such is the power of television drama, a power that Mr. Roddenberry knows perhaps better than any other television producer. Only drama can draw the audience into the story, make the viewer a part of the story, make the story "real". And it is the refusal by television executives to use this power in any but the most crass, commercialized fashion that has made television what it is today.

Yet while such things are important today, Mr. Roddenberry's forte is the future and it is the future of the television industry that worries him. Technology appears to progressing at an increasing geometric rate. If the communication industry makes greater advances in the next fifty years that it has in the last, and the ruling mentality of the industry remains the same, the possibilities are frightening, or perhaps disgusting is the better word. If we have the technology to allow every person in this world access to the sum knowledge of the entire human race, and then restrict that access to "commercially profitable" programs and commercials for hemmoroid ointments, why did we even bother?

Yet it may not come to that. Looking at the present world situation as a realist it is impossible to ignore the possibility that civilization as we know it may not be around much longer. Not only the economic crisis, and the depletion of natural resources but the inevitability of war that hunger and greed brings. Mr. Roddenberry's answer to this is simple: it wouldn't be a completely bad thing. To some extent the idea even appeals to him. He used Rome as an example its fall inspired an even greater society. Who knows what Phoenix might rise from our ashes? Perhaps one that would meet Mr. Roddenberry's definition of an adult society: "where our ability to love becomes greater than our capacity to destroy."

He tried to explore the possibilities of such a society in his recent TV pilots "Genesis II" and "Planet Earth", which were tentatively sold to CBS. Then the "Ape" phenemon occured, and CBS didn't want to buy a program unless it had apes in it. "The public wants apes," they told Roddenberry. "Put apes in your program and we'll buy it." As you know, CBS didn't buy it.

What then, does the future hold for Mr. Roddenberry and the Trekkies? The possibility of a full-length Star Trek movie, for one. Paramount likes the idea, although they want to bring in a couple of big-name stars to "insure it's success." The consistency of the mentality in the entertainment industry is unreal. The millions of Trekkies across the country who sent in letters asking NBC to put Star Trek back on the air should show them that the picture will make money. But they just can't believe in Star Trek, even now. Everything is money, reduced to the lowest mental denominator. Maybe it has to be that way, but it isn't suppose to be. It's suppose to be fun.

S/Bill Hays
New RG Xword

ACROSS
1 adverse parties
11 supported by
12 actor Ryan --
13 direction(abr.)
14 reporter system
15 rip again
19 fed. reg. body(abr.)
21 Gk. city-state
22 forbids to allege
26 pro-gun org.(abr.)
29 hard money
30 local ecology group(abr.)
32 the(Fr.)
33 reception room
35 each(abr.)
36 American folk hero(2 wds.)

DOWN
1 --v.Post
3 heart vessel
4 bury
6 prep.
7 large ins. co.
8 RR workers bill(abr.)
9 ticket price
10 Solicitor at Law(abr.)
16 Cantos' poet(in.)
17 oxygen compounds(suff.)
18 woodworking tool
20 non-positive law
23 code-sending device(abr.)
24 sea
25 3.1415926589...
27 cut crops
28 there(Sp.)
31 guitar composer Fernando --
33 retirement agency(abr.)
34 negative

ANSWERS SOMEWHERE ELSE IN THIS ISSUE

9.
social activities (mixers and films) are generating more revenue than expected and
are nearly paying for themselves; special interest groups have thusfar not used their
appropriations at the expected rate; and there was a two to three thousand dollar
carryover from last year.

Discussion revealed the interesting fact that the $10 per year per student of the
Law School fee which is supposedly earmarked for LSSS does not automatically go
to LSSS. The money, it seems, is put into an account controlled by the Dean and al­
located to LSSS when and if it is required. Presumably the Dean retains control of
funds that are not "required."

Considerable discussion was devoted to the
matter of the microwave oven which dis­
appeared from the lounge in the basement
of Hutchins. Epithets were directed at
the vending company which operates there
and is presumably responsible for removing
the oven. Radical action was considered,
but for the time-being one member of the
LSSS volunteered to check into the possi­
bilities of getting the oven back or, fail­
ing cooperation by the vending company,
possibilities of installing a microwave
oven unit purchased by LSSS.

Problems in obtaining volunteers to orga­
nize and supervise Sherry Hours were dis­
cussed, with many alternatives proposed in­
cluding paying the organizer and possible
closer cooperation with the Law Club food
service. A very commendable proposal for
a TGIF every week ran into economic and
organizational objections, but notably was
not ruled out.

The regular LSSS meeting time for the term
was set for 6:00 p.m. on Monday of each
week. I think everyone should go to at
least one of these meetings during his or
her three years. Certainly one should at­
tend a meeting to find out how things work
before criticizing the LSSS. Such attend­
ance will not only prevent unjust criticisms,
but will provide plenty of material for
just and constructive criticism.

A resolution commending the good work of
the LC dietitian was approved.

The task of discussing (and presumably
setting) rates for room and meals at the
LC next year was delegated to the Food
Committee which was renamed the Food and

James T. Banks and Jeffrey Haynes, student
codirectors of the project, say Novi and
Grand Haven, Mich., are among the communi­
ties expressing an early interest in the project.

The students say the workshops include
"simulation games" which allow participants
to play the role of various community
interest groups under hypothetical con­
ditions. The objective is to heighten
players' awareness of land-use problems,
as seen from many perspectives.

Such games are offered to community and
educational groups around the state by
the U-M Extension Gaming Service. The
University is a national leader in gaming
research and development.

The Environmental Law Society is calling
its project "PRELUDE" (Process of Enriching
Land-Use Decision-Making). The students
say the workshops will be designed for
city officials as well as interested local
citizens.

Among other activities, the Environmental
Law Society this year has drafted state
legislation to preserve wetlands in Michigan
and has proposed administrative rules to
make information of the Michigan Natural
Resources Commission more easily available
to the public. The Commission is the
policy-making body governing activities of
the state Department of Natural Resources.

Questioner: I haven't taken Trust and
Estates.

A. Also I wonder about all the pain I
went thru the first year. I felt, I
don't know, down and depressed much of the
time. I feel better now but I wonder if
it was worth the pain. I understand some
first year students have gotten together...good...I wonder why we didn't?

(Next week: an RG Editor speakout.)
The question of whether or not to purchase and serve in the Lawyers Club dining hall such iceberg or head lettuce as is currently under the boycott has engendered considerable controversy. The Law School Student Senate has resolved to put the issue to a referendum of all Lawyers Club residents, holders of meal contracts, and holders of six meal tickets as of January 20, 1975. Unfortunately, the anti-boycott forces have disenfranchised the majority of the law school by this limiting the constituency of the referendum. A petition is now being circulated demanding an honest referendum in which the entire student body will be allowed to participate.

It should be pointed out that passage of the boycott resolution will not mean the end of all lettuce in the dining hall. UFW lettuce will be available in season, (20% of the time), and lettuce not under boycott, such as romaine, will be available at all times. We are not asking students to give up lettuce altogether, but merely to change brands. Surely in light of the terribly oppressive conditions endured by farmworkers this is a modest enough request.

The referendum will be held on Tuesday Feb. 11. Volunteers are urgently needed to help organize the boycott campaign.

Please sign the list in the Lawyers Guild office, 110 LR.

Law School Boycott Committee

THIS WEEK'S CROSSWORD ANSWERS

```
| W | E | N | D | V | O | X | I | C | S |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| L | E | T | T | T | T | T | T | T | T |
| S | M | S | M | S | M | S | M | S | M |
| A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B |
| Y | P | Y | P | Y | P | Y | P | Y | P |
| N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N | N |
```

Terry noted that we should get a liquor license for our next mixer, since the police closed down last term's Graduate Coffee Hour because they didn't have one. It will take at least ten days to get one, putting off our first mixer for at least two weeks.

Motion: Redesignate the Food Committee as the Food and Rate Committee, and appoint them to meet with Max on setting next year's rates. Friendly Amendment: Appoint Joe to the Committee (so he can say "No" every time Max asks for a rate increase). Motion passed, with tongue in cheek.

Motion: "Be it resolved: The LSSS wishes to thank Sherry for her invaluable aid and assistance during the past term. Also, we would like to express a special appreciation for her improvements in the food service, and her efforts in resolving student complaints." Passed unanimously.

A request will be made to the Faculty Committee to make model answers for exams available in the Library.

The referendum on the lettuce issue was then discussed. The wording that was finally approved for the ballot is:

"Should the Lawyer's Club stop buying lettuce boycotted by the UFW? Yes. No. (Circle One)". At this point the Secretary left the meeting. (The discussion continued on the lettuce boycott, and I will try to write a comprehensive article on the various positions for next week's RG. --BH).

Respectfully submitted,

Bill Hays
Rates Committee. This group must meet with the LC Director in its deliberations. The time of the meeting was not specified, and I doubt there will be a popular announcement, so LC residents might want to talk things over with their friendly F & R committee people in the near future.

*A resolution was passed and referred to the appropriate faculty committee endorsing a student proposal that all faculty be required to make available to students model answers to all exam questions.

*The LC lettuce boycott referendum was set for February 11 and the wording of the proposition was finalized after considerable heated (though essentially civil) discussion. Those permitted to vote will be all persons with LC meal contracts or holding a block of meal tickets (6-meals) as of January 20, 1975. A simple majority will rule. Campaign rules are the same as those of other LSSS elections.

*S/George Vinyard

*An attempt to expand voter eligibility in the lettuce referendum to all law students failed, but gave rise to accusations of arbitrariness on the part of the chair. The chair appealed to Robert's Rule of Order on the matter, upon which it was alleged that parliamentary authority is imposed arbitrarily by the arbitrary chair. Shortly thereafter the meeting was adjourned.

S/George Vinyard

**LAST WEEK'S PUZZLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROWN</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIAR</td>
<td>WAUSAUL</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSIS</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>REA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>SORGHUM</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUTE</td>
<td>HELP PICK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>VO</td>
<td>STOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLEEPY</td>
<td>LULU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>MR</td>
<td>SEISIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Law Revue Isn't Big Enough For the Two of Us"

"Gunners"
SEXISM IN THE FOURTH GRADE
--Being an account of how I tried to make fourth-graders aware of sex roles, stereotypes, and POTOS; and how I in turn became aware of cooties, girl-touch, and the illegibility of fourth-graders' handwriting.

By Kevin Karkau

The fourth-grade open classroom where I student-teach is composed of 18 boys and 10 girls. A high percentage of the students at the school have a parent(s) who is a professional, and the income level is thus relatively high. In the classroom, two students are of oriental background, 26 are white, and the teacher is young, female, and white. The classroom is "open" in that there are no letter grades given, students may work at their own pace on designated workbooks and in areas of personal interest, and they are given 15 minutes of free time in the morning and the afternoon to do as they wish. There are some structured activities, such as art and music classes. Perhaps the greatest difference between the "open" and the "traditional" classrooms is that students are freer to move about in the "open" classroom.

The inspiration for the activities brought in was the behavior of the children. There was a definite problem, in that boys and girls rarely associated with each other. The children could place their desks wherever they wished, but the result was that boys and girls did not sit together. They formed two separate lines—one for boys and one for girls—whenever they went to art class or math lab although the teacher had never asked them to do so. Boys played soccer at recess while most girls played pom-pom or tag. In art class boys and girls sat at separate tables. In math lab, they played separate math games. They teased each other when someone touched a Person of the Opposite Sex (which I will call a POTOS), formed all-girl and all-boy groups for creative writing exercises, sat in two rows for music class, and worst of all, rarely talked with each other.

The children's segregated behavior could be attributed to a "natural stage" that children go through, but I believed that the behavior was a result of socialization processes. Surely this segregation was unhealthy and limiting for those people who wished to associate with a POTOS. I decided to implement some activities with the following goals in mind: (1) making the children aware of unequal treatment given to females in society and in their classroom, (2) getting the kids to feel more free about associating with a POTOS, (3) examining how males and females are stereotyped into certain roles and the effects of such stereotyping, and (4) helping to broaden the children's perspectives of what they may do with their lives.

Change must first begin with the teacher. Teacher awareness will include substantially equal expectations for boys and girls, equal attention, encouraging the children to interact more, pointing out unfair or stereotyped treatment of females in textbooks, movies, readers, and people's attitudes, sharing of classroom responsibilities between boys and girls (running the projector, carrying books, reading aloud), playing equally with boys and girls at recess, and, if oral reading is done by the teacher, selection of non-sexually stereotyped books. Luckily, the teacher in this class was excellent at not discriminating, but there was also little encouragement to interact with a POTOS.
Learning by example can only lead so far, though. For this classroom, some consciousness-raising activities were needed. The first activity was discovered on page 33 of the tremendously helpful booklet Sexism in Education, published by the Emma Willard Task Force on Education, of Minneapolis. The purpose of the activity is to get a feel for the students' attitudes towards men and women. The mimeographed sheet that was handed out to the children is in the back of this report. Here are the instructions I gave to the class:

1. Individually I would like each boy to think of some one-word characteristics of a man, and each girl to think of some characteristics of a woman. Then write the characteristics on the mimeographed sheet. If you have difficulty thinking of characteristics, think of a man or woman you know. If you don't think men or women have any special characteristics, list what an ideal person would be like. In any case, try to list at least five characteristics.
2. From your first list, choose the characteristics that you like and list them in the second column.
3. Now form groups of three to five people of your own sex. In your group, each one should read their lists out loud. If you don't know the meaning of a word, ask.
4. Decide, as a group, on ten characteristics that you believe are most important for a male (for the boys) or a female (for the girls) to have. Then rank these items from one to ten in order of importance. It is essential that you all participate in the decision.

The students were asked to work on characteristics of their own sex because it was felt that a freer choice of characteristics and more natural discussion of the importance of the items would result, but mixed groups and both sexes working the same sex are possible variations. This section of the activity required about one hour, and the first discussion took place four days later.

On looking over the groups' ideal persons, most of the characteristics that the groups decided on were unisexual—that is, they could be important to both sexes. But there were some differences, especially in the first column (the typical man or woman). There, the traditional views towards men and women showed up. Men were brave, strong, healthy, humorous, kind; women were gentle, pretty, good cooks, clean, and smart. In general, the children described men and women in terms of the traditional stereotypes. In the third column (the ideal man or woman), the differences were more subtle but still noticeable. Here are the seven groups' lists, with the number of people in each group in parenthesis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. understanding 6. firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good mannered 7. smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. gentle 8. clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. loving 9. active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. hard worker 10. confident</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III (3)</th>
<th>IV (3)</th>
<th>V (4)</th>
<th>VI (3)</th>
<th>VII (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nice</td>
<td>1. healthy</td>
<td>1. perfect</td>
<td>1. honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. good personality</td>
<td>1. healthy</td>
<td>1. perfect</td>
<td>1. honest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. good looking</td>
<td>2. true</td>
<td>2. educational</td>
<td>2. smart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. good sport</td>
<td>3. kind</td>
<td>3. brave</td>
<td>2. fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. smart</td>
<td>4. serious</td>
<td>4. friendly</td>
<td>3. real</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. brave</td>
<td>5. happy</td>
<td>5. creative</td>
<td>4. kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. patient</td>
<td>6. active</td>
<td>6. cheerful</td>
<td>5. helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. well-off</td>
<td>7. nice</td>
<td>7. imaginative</td>
<td>6. humorous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. kind</td>
<td>8. quick</td>
<td>8. peacefull</td>
<td>7. imaginative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. intelligent</td>
<td>9. fast</td>
<td>9. uncompetitive</td>
<td>8. peaceful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I make no great attempts at analyzing these lists, but notice that the girls tended to list qualities necessary for helping other people (perhaps defining themselves in terms of others), while the boys described qualities of a more individualistic nature.

The discussion required two class periods of about 45 minutes each. For the discussion, we all moved into a small corner of the room and sat on the floor. Almost everyone participated, except for three boys who played chess in the corner, but even they were partially listening. The plan was to examine whether males and females should have completely equal opportunities in everything, and to point out the discrepancy between the people the children had described and their behavior in the classroom. (For anyone attempting this activity, it is important to have some broad areas of study in mind, as one can easily get sidetracked during the discussion.)

Two lists were written on the blackboard (numerals I and V) and we discussed the question "to which sex does each list refer?" The children could determine easily that I referred to girls, V to boys. Next we went through the lists and put a check mark by the qualities that could apply to both males and females. Everyone agreed that all the qualities could apply, but there were disagreements over the order of importance. One boy objected strongly to placing "good mannered" (sic) second in importance. He conceived "good mannered" as meaning opening doors for women and seating women at tables. We then discussed why men perform such chivalric deeds, whether women should perform the same deeds, and whether such niceties are really necessary. The girls expressed no strong opinions about such actions, but most of the boys seemed to be repulsed by the idea of being polite to girls—probably due more to fear of being teased than a belief that girls could fend for themselves.

We next went to the third word on the boys' list—"equal"—and discussed its ramifications. How equal should men and women be? Should women have equal job opportunities? Should they have the freedom to be tough, strong, brave, active, as men are traditionally supposed to be? Should boys be able to cry freely and not be teased for it? Are there any qualities that are peculiarly masculine or feminine? What does the word "stereotype" mean? What can we do in the classroom to break down stereotypes? These were some of the questions asked in the discussion.
Everyone believed that men and women should have equal job opportunities. There was less vociferous consensus on the next question, which really asked "to what extent should people be able to behave as they wish?" General opinion among the boys was that "if girls want to act in a 'masculine' way, sure, that's fine;" but it could be seen that most boys didn't want girls to act like boys and couldn't understand why a girl would want to. When asked if boys should be able to cry freely, or play with dolls, the boys snickered a lot but said "sure, if they want to." It was clear that few of them wanted to. Females can certainly have the same job opportunities as males, but the boys were not quite ready to accept equality of personality opportunities. The girls were wholeheartedly in favor of such freedom.

We next discussed the word "stereotype." A boy read the dictionary definition--"a conventional and usually oversimplified conception or belief"--and we discussed how stereotypes work in everyday life. "How many of you have moms that work?" I asked them. "Does your dad ever cook? How many male elementary teachers and female principals have you seen?" Many children had moms that worked and dads that cooked. When the boys were asked if they ever cooked, most seemed a little offended and said "no, because we just don't want to."

I then asked the group if anyone could think of qualities that were peculiarly masculine or feminine. No one could think of any. Now was the time to bring out the discrepancy between their attitudes and behavior. "I don't understand something," I said. "Here you have listed characteristics that could apply to both men and women, you have agreed that males and females should have equal opportunities, that there are no distinctly masculine or feminine qualities; yet in the classroom and at recess, boys and girls hardly ever associate with each other. Why?" No one replied, so I moved the discussion to a more concrete area--that of sports. If equality in the sports area can be achieved, other areas quickly follow. I asked the class why girls didn't play soccer more at recess--was there any discrimination on the boys' part? Some boys were upset at that thought and quickly defended themselves. "They can play if they want to," said the boys, "but they just don't want to." I asked the girls if they felt free to play soccer. Most replied affirmatively, but said they simply didn't want to play soccer. But one girl who played soccer occasionally brought out some real reasons for the lack of female participation. "First of all," she said, "the boys never ask us to play. Then when we do play, only boys are chosen to be captains. And girls don't get the ball passed to them very often, and when a girl scores a goal, the boys don't cheer." I asked the boys if that was true, and they argued a great deal, but finally agreed that the girls had legitimate complaints.

Next I asked the class if they could think of other areas in their classroom where girls were treated unfairly. No one could think of any, so I pointed out the way they were currently sitting. It was as if a wall were separating the sexes--girls on one side, boys on the other. The children looked around as if they had never realized the separation before, then let out a collective sigh of amazement. I then asked them why they formed two lines whenever they went out of the classroom. Some of the boys said that the teacher had told them to do so. But the teacher and the girls quickly corrected that statement. The teacher then asked if previous teachers had told them to form two lines. No teachers had, which showed that the segregation by sex was voluntary, and thus deeply socialized into the children by their experiences outside school.
The first discussion ended and the children went out for recess. There were some immediately noticeable results. Eight girls played soccer, more so than ever before. There were at least three occasions where boys and girls talked to each other. One girl kept touching a boy she liked, teasing him about his hair, but really seeking for some sign of interest. When the students returned and lined up for art class, one girl formed the girls' line on the side where the boys usually stood. "Hey, that's the boys' side," said some boys, whereupon the girls dared the boys to stand on their usual side. The boys weren't quite ready yet to stand close to girls, so that day two lines were still formed.

For the second discussion, the goals were to discover reasons why boys and girls interacted so rarely, to make them more aware of their behavior and its limiting effects on people, suggest activities where the kids could interact more with a POTOS (such as helping with classwork, integrating the art tables and lines), and, if they seemed ready, initiate a reward system (M&M's) for performance of integrating activities. All but the last goal was accomplished, as I decided that rewards would be punishing to those people who were not yet ready to interact freely.

One major reason why males and females don't interact so naturally in our society is that an overemphasis on physical attraction interferes. When a male and female are simply talking to each other, to many this connotes that a sexual attraction exists, even though there may be none. The problem manifests itself even in the fourth grade. I asked the class "why don't you talk with or even go near a POTOS more?" The answers--"People will think you're 'in love' with the person," said many girls; while for the boys, "if you touch a girl you get 'cooties' or 'girl-touch'" (a mysterious quality which can only be removed by saying "no gives"). Obviously, those who act on their feelings are subject to ridicule or embarrassment, in the fourth grade and in society. So I asked the kids why people say such things, and why they themselves take the sayings seriously. There were no explanations, except that people have always done it, and everyone agreed that the sayings were not necessarily true, but that it was difficult to ignore the laughter and ridicule. Getting this point into the open helped to ease the tension in interactions with a POTOS. Everyone believed privately that talking with or touching a POTOS signified next to nothing in itself, but as long as the group enforced its opinion on interactions, it was difficult to disregard the group.

I next attempted to show some negative effects of sexual stereotyping through personal experience. When I was in grade school, I would become very frustrated at failure and break out in tears. Crying only made me feel worse, though, because I was a boy, and boys weren't supposed to cry. This previously untold revelation was difficult for me to relate, but the kids seemed to understand completely. Hopefully it made them realize that expression of emotion should not be limited to one sex.

In the third section of the discussion I asked the children if they could think of specific activities they could perform in the classroom to help reduce the separation between the sexes. "Invite the girls to play soccer," said one boy. "Stand in the boys' line," said a girl. After that, though, there were no other suggestions, and although many people were interacting more with a POTOS, some were clearly uninterested in the whole issue. I decided to simply list some activities they could do with a POTOS, but not reward people with candy (simply praise) for doing the activities. The list included sitting near, helping standing in line, talking playing sports, saying something nice about a POTOS, and not laughing when people associated with a POTOS.
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There was a group of about four boys who seemed to take no interest in the subjects of sex stereotyping and interaction with a POTOS. The reason was fairly simple. In changing their behavior to a situation where unlimited opportunities for living one's life are available, many people lose their security of an already-defined role. The boys didn't understand the long-term benefits of such a change, and felt threatened by loss of their male status. Perhaps even worse, they were afraid of being coerced into changing their behavior. They didn't want to talk with girls or play sports with them, and when someone talked to them about changing roles and interacting with a POTOS, they turned their minds off in fear. Individual attention and explanation is necessary for such people, but they must also be given the option of not changing.

The next logical step, since the class as a group was not completely prepared for natural interaction, was small group discussions. I brought in some advertisements that showed women and men in stereotyped manner, and prepared some questions on the effects of advertising. Two discussions of about a half-hour each were held over the same material, with volunteer groups of six people each. I had previously asked the four boys who seemed uninterested in the subject to volunteer, and two of them did so.

The ads showed women in passive roles, concerned with beauty and pleasing men; while men were shown in tough, outdoorsy roles, such as racing, canoeing, and herding horses. Such ads can be found in almost any magazine; my sources were *Glamour, Cosmopolitan, Esquire, and Newsweek*. The general goals were to show the overemphasis on beauty in advertising, how sex and glamour are used to sell products, and how ads reinforce stereotyped attitudes about men and women. The points came across well, as everyone understood and could think of other television and magazine ads that furthered sex typing.

But more important than the discussion that day was a change in the children's behavior. Four days had elapsed between the second discussion and the small group discussions, and in that time the girls and boys occasionally played together at recess, and another good discussion over an article in the weekly news-magazine had taken place. The article concerned sex roles, and the kids were strongly critical of some unfair views in the article. I state these facts to illustrate how long it took for some fundamental behavior changes to occur.

Anyway, after the small group discussions, two girls decided to integrate the boys' line. The lines were just forming and the two girls stepped behind two boys, while I was the only male in the girls' line. Immediately the two boys left the line and tried to stand behind me, but some girls arrived first. The boys looked around, realized they would have to stand next to a girl, and as the rest of the class arrived, the lines dissolved into one big integrated line. There was much excited teasing and talking between boys and girls as we walked to the art room, and once there, boys and girls sat together at tables, although not too closely. It was gratifying, to say the least, to see such behavior changes.

Two days later, another major change occurred in the classroom. The same two girls who integrated the lines moved their desks into a boys' group (after asking the boys first). Other girls quickly followed suit and asked to join boys' groups. I suggested to two girls that they ask two of the shyest boys in the classroom to sit with them. The girls were also too shy to ask however, so I served as intermediary and persuaded the boys to sit with the girls. After sitting all year in a corner of the room, the boys moved to the center of the room and sat in a group with girls. There was a tremendous amount of noise and confusion with the desks.
scraping on the floor and boys and girls talking, teasing, and flirting with each other. At recess, everyone played pom-pom (a traditionally girls' game at the school). By the end of the day, there were three integrated groups of ten, five, and five people, plus various other all-male groups.

An activity on jobs was partially implemented. The students were asked to write on the following subject: "Imagine you are grown up. Describe a typical day." The purpose was to discover if boys conceived of their adulthood in terms of career goals, while girls conceived of it in terms of domestic life, as in the Iglitzin-Fiedler study ("A Child's Eye View of Sex Roles," Today's Education, Dec. 1972, pp. 23-25). If so, a study of job opportunities would be helpful in expanding the children's awareness of options. But the essays did not turn out well—some children did not understand whether to write about a job they might be doing or just a typical day's activities; others expressed no ideas about their future; while others had spring fever and couldn't write much. So nothing further was done with the subject.

Another discussion was held to examine the children's feelings towards the changes in the classroom and to suggest or entertain ideas for further change. The consensus was that people enjoyed the opportunities for increased association with a POTOS, felt more free to interact, and teased others less when they interacted with a POTOS. But there were no further suggestions for change, except to try individually to be less sensitive to unjust ridicule.

For the final week, two movies were shown to the class. The first one, Psychological Differences Between the Sexes, portrayed men and women in a stereotyped manner and attributed personality differences between the sexes to natural occurrences, not socialization processes. For example, men were typified as being blunt, tending toward direct action, and naturally stronger. Women were shown as more concerned with physical appearance, took general comments personally (more sensitive to criticism), and were more romantic.

I asked the children to write some reactions immediately after the film was over. Here is a sample of their comments:

It was not true about a man is stronger than a woman. Because there was a woman who could rip a coat of chain mail with her bare hands.

It isn't always true that just women think about what is said about another person. I do sometimes.

It was stupid because the man was doing all the work and the lady was picking up little sticks.

I don't think girls are like they said. I am not like that at all.

We then discussed the film and the classroom in greater detail. The most interesting information from the discussion was that while teasing people for associating with a POTOS had decreased within the classroom, the change had not transferred to outside the classroom. There, the children still experienced teasing that was difficult to ignore. I asked them why other people teased them. There was a long silence, then one girl gave exactly the right answer—"because they've probably been teased too." We decided that the best way to handle such a situation was to either ignore it or explain to the other person why it was wrong to tease someone for associating with a POTOS.
Two days later the kids saw another film entitled Anything You Want To Be. It concerned a girl's career goals (doctor, chemist, class president) and what she actually ended up doing (nurse, mixing baby formulas, class secretary). People kept telling her that she could be anything she wanted to be, but because she was female, the dreams never came true. Even after two showings, the children had a difficult time understanding the idea, as the movie was full of fantasy, subtlety, and symbolism. Also, being young and in a liberal community, the children had not yet experienced society's full oppression against women. Perhaps the ideas contained in this movie will make more sense to the kids as they grow older.

The last activity was a student evaluation of the changes in the classroom. Twenty-four evaluations were turned in, and as can be seen, a high percentage indicated that they felt more at ease in various activities with a POTOS:

1. Since the activities and discussions began on sex stereotyping and male and female behavior, how much at ease do you feel with people of the opposite sex in each of the following situations?
   a. talking with them
   b. standing in line
   c. sitting next to them
   d. helping (in any way)
   e. playing at recess
   f. touching

   much less 1 less 0 same 7 more 11 much more 5
   much less 0 less 0 same 9 more 6 much more 9
   much less 0 less 0 same 8 more 9 much more 7
   much less 1 less 0 same 11 more 8 much more 4
   much less 1 less 0 same 13 more 5 much more 5
   much less 1 less 0 same 11 more 8 much more 4

2. In the classroom, do you think there is less or more teasing when a boy and a girl associate (talk, touch, etc.)?

   much less 9 less 10 same 1 more 1 much more 0

3. Outside the classroom, do you think there is less or more teasing when a boy and a girl associate?

   much less 3 less 5 same 5 more 5 much more 0

4. Have any of your ideas about men and women changed?

   yes 12 no 10

5. If your ideas have changed, please describe at least one change (more if you can).

6. Please use the space below to list any other comments you may have about the activities—use the back of this paper if necessary. Please think hard. Thank you for filling out this evaluation.
For the last two questions, only nine people wrote about a change in their ideas or commented on the activities. But the attitude changes towards men and women seemed to be healthy, and the comments were all favorable. Here are some examples:

5. Most boys in the class don't mind sitting with, talking to, and touching girls.

At least in our classroom I think everyone likes people more.

They seem to like each other more now because of standing in line together, etc.

6. I think these activities have helped a lot.

I think you have changed the class a little but it helped.

I think outside the classroom is the same—girl-touch, being teased, and so on.

I liked it except the discussions.

I think boys and girls should get jobs just as easy and they should be equal.

Student evaluations must always be taken with a grain of salt, however, as young children tend to answer as the teacher wants them to. There is also the possibility that they will misunderstand the questions; and where are the comments of the people who were uninterested in the activities? But taking into consideration the behavior and attitude changes in the classroom, there is no other interpretation then that these evaluations represent fairly accurately the increased association of boys and girls on a more natural basis.

There have been some definite and seemingly permanent behavior and attitude changes. There is more communication between the sexes, boys and girls feel freer to sit, talk, and play together, and they are more sensitive to sexual stereotyping. The five goals stated at the beginning of this report were accomplished with most of the class. For those who didn't become more free to associate with a POTOS, there was nothing completely wrong with that, either. They must certainly be allowed the option of not associating with a POTOS, as the goal was not to force people to interact, but to expand their opportunities for interaction.

For anyone attempting similar activities, here are some suggestions:

1. Keep an overall view of your goals and ways of implementing them, but also be flexible enough to match the children's moods.
2. Don't go too fast, and be ready to backtrack. Children learn at different rates. (The activities described required only about eight class hours, but it took fifteen days for behavior to change significantly).
3. Be very sensitive to the interactions between the boys and girls. Try to understand what a change in role means for a boy and a girl, and provide some viable role alternatives.
4. Devise some relevant questions for consciousness-raising periods. Tailor the discussion to the problems of the classroom, not just society.
5. If something has affected you deeply, share it with the students. They'll sympathize and perhaps reveal some of their own experiences.
6. Never coerce the students to act in a manner which is clearly not to their desires.
In a way, these activities have required the children to act in a more mature way than adults do—to ignore a person's gender as a measure of ability, to allow people to define their own role, to tolerate various behaviors—but that is exactly the point of education. The value of such education can be seen in the increased associations between boys and girls in the classroom, in their more sociable personalities, and in their positive comments about the activities. The difficulties of the project, such as lack of interest inside the classroom and non-understanding outside the classroom, are only symptomatic of what the children may face in the future. In that sense, the final value of the project depends on the degree to which the ideas I've attempted to communicate can help the children in their future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS OF A WOMAN (OR MAN)</th>
<th>WHICH OF THE CHARACTERISTICS DO YOU LIKE?</th>
<th>IN YOUR GROUP, SELECT 10 ITEMS FROM THE COMBINED LISTS THAT ARE MOST IMPORTANT, RANK THEM, IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kevin is pursuing requirements for completion of a B.G.S. degree from the University. He lives in Owen Coop, and may be reached at 761-3957 if anyone wishes to discuss the above article with him.
The final football poll of the season was won by Craig Gehring with a mark of 18-6. The overall percentage was .457. Larry J. Erwin was the only person that predicted that the Steelers would win the Super Bowl.

Paul "Lefty" Ruschmann won the initial basketball poll of the season by guessing correctly 67% of the time. The overall law school performance was a dismal .467.

Both Messrs. Gehring and Ruschmann are distinguished members of the RG panel of experts who each week determine the reknown RG Rankings. However, there is no conflict of interest—you can be sure of that.

There is one other item that must be discussed. Last week two of the games mentioned in the poll did not exist. In addition, Carolina rather than California was named in the RG Rankings. Many people were kind enough to point out these errors to me. Most of them felt something was wrong, because they knew Carolina doesn’t exist. But Carolina does exist, just ask Ross Miller or Harold L. Kennedy III. Of course after they lost for the ninth straight time to State by blowing a six point lead in the last minute and a half, the Heels’ existence was somewhat questionable. In any event, I accept the blame—and even the responsibility—for the confusion.

Georgia (15½) at Alabama
Arizona St. at Wyoming (20½)
Arizona at Colorado St. (10½)
Syracuse (10½) at Boston College
Florida (8½) at Kentucky
Illinois (8½) at Ohio State
Purdue (8½) at Indiana
Minnesota at Iowa (8½)
Oklahoma St. (6½) at Kansas
Louisville (½) at Bradley
North Carolina (8½) at Maryland
Wisconsin (12½) at Michigan St.
Northwestern (12½) at Michigan
NC State at Wake Forest (8½)
UCLA at Notre Dame (6½)
Oregon at Oregon St. (3½)
Pennsylvania (3½) at Providence
Rutgers at Pittsburgh (5½)
Dayton (4½) at DePaul
Detroit at Xavier (7½)