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LETTUCE REFERENDUM

On Tuesday, February 11, 1975 a referendum will be held to determine whether or not the Lawyers Club will continue to purchase lettuce currently being boycotted by the United Farm Workers.

Those persons eligible to vote are:
1) All persons residing in the Lawyers Club as of January 20, 1975 and who have a meal contract with the Club. (This includes non-law students.)
2) All persons who have a meal contract with the Lawyers Club as of January 20, 1975.
3) All persons who purchased meal tickets from the Lawyers Club in lots of 6 meals or more between August 30, 1974 and January 20, 1975.

All persons eligible to vote must present valid identification.

The Law School Student Senate has voted to promulgate the following regulations concerning campaigning:
1) No more than $25 may be spent per side for publicity.
2) There will be no campaigning within 25 feet of the polling place.

Voting will be conducted in the Lawyers Club Lounge on February 11, 1975 from 11:00 AM to 1:00 PM and from 5:00 PM to 7:00 PM. The question presented on the ballot shall read:

"Should the Lawyers Club stop buying lettuce boycotted by the United Farm Workers -----------Yes or No"

D.C. CLINIC

On Thursday, February 6, Herbert Semmel will be interviewing students who are interested in spending '75 Fall Semester in the Clinical Law Program at the Center for Law and Social Policy in Washington, D.C. Mr. Semmel will discuss the clinical program at a group meeting from 12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m. in Room 132 Hutchins Hall, along with conducting individual interviews during the morning and afternoon. Students interested in the program may pick up material on the Center from the Placement Office.

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

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

Its recent cases include Wilderness Society v. Morton, a challenge to the construction of the Alaska Pipeline; Consumers Union v. Rogers, in which a Federal Judge recently ruled the arrangements restraining steel imports are not exempt from the antitrust laws; EDF v. Peterson, after which the Department of Commerce agreed to file environmental impact statements for ship construction subsidies; and Kaimowitz v. Michigan Dept. Mental Health, where a three-judge court held that psychosurgery could not be performed on an involuntarily committed mental patient.

The Center will select from 3 to 6 students from the Michigan Law School to spend the '75 Fall Semester in Washington with students from Pennsylvania, Stanford, Yale and UCLA. The students work closely with lawyers on all of the Center's cases.

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD winter term organizational meeting: Monday February 3, 1975 9:30 P.M. at Susan G's House (MAP in Guild Office).
I'm not sure to whom this letter should be addressed so I'll address it to the faculty in general. In the two years that I've worked for Legal Aid in Washtenaw County, I've become more and more disgusted with the lip service that our faculty provides in the way of support for making legal services available for people who can't afford private counsel.

Maybe my disgust stems from the treatment accorded letters from prisoners and poor people throughout the state who write to the law school seeking assistance. The standard procedure of the law school is to read the letter, retape it, and stamp on the front of it "Legal Aid" and then forget about it.

When I entered this law school three years ago, MIAP was a vital organization which provided a source of legal representation for inmates at Jackson and Milan prisons. Presently MIAP is all but dead due to the inability of the students involved in the organization to obtain the assistance of any attorneys or law professors in the way of practical legal advice in handling the cases.

I can understand the reluctance of the law school and the faculty to respond to the numerous letters and requests for assistance which are addressed to the school. But I cannot understand how a "concerned" faculty can let an organization die which offers invaluable aid for local prisoners, and also provides an excellent opportunity for law students to gain experience.

Maybe I'm a bleeding heart type, but it bothers me to get letters and phone calls from relatives of prisoners who beg us to help their imprisoned relative get medical or psychiatric help. What bothers me more is to have to say "I'm sorry, we can't help you".

Where is our illustrious faculty when it comes time to translate their great liberal viewpoints into some positive action. I suppose it's easier to sit back and write law review articles and check Supreme Court decisions for footnotes citing your article than it is to practice what you preach.

I don't mean to level a blanket charge at the faculty. I'm sure that on an individual level any faculty member would be willing to help out on an individual problem. In fact, often times I've asked for assistance and received it.

So how about it, faculty? Where were the great commentators of the criminal law field when some real people could have used some real support.

By way of disclaimer, my views in no way represent those of Legal Aid as a body, but rather only those of myself as a person who is somewhat tired of listening to people talk out of both sides of their mouths at the same time.

Terry S. Latanich
U of M Legal Aid
MANY NEW LAWYERS NEEDED

Conceding that the current job outlook is bleak for new lawyers, the president of the American Bar Association said today that vast numbers of new lawyers will be needed in the coming decade to meet the public demand for legal services.

John D. Fellers, Oklahoma City attorney, said in an address to the Willamette University College of Law that 70 percent of the American public is without legal services.

Not the least of reasons for this is that they believe legal services are too expensive, Fellers said.

He predicted that, through efforts of the organized bar, dramatic steps will be taken to lower the cost of legal services and to help provide reasonable ways of financing legal aid.

Ways to cut the cost of legal services, Fellers said, include greater use of para-professionals, lawyer specialization, professional publication of the availability of legal services and increased use of technology, such as computer programs.

The ABA president called for public education programs to support the concept of preventive law.

"Lawyers are decades behind other profession in this regard," Fellers said. "Today it is the rare individual indeed who comes to a lawyer to make sure that he is not getting involved in potential legal problems. Ninety-nine percent of the people who come to lawyers have gone past the stage when they could have been helped most readily and most efficiently."

Fellers is on a tour of colleges in the northwest with appearances scheduled at Lewis and Clark College's Northwestern School of Law in Portland Tuesday (Jan 28), and the University of Puget Sound School of Law in Tacoma, Wash., Thursday (Jan. 30).

LSSS REPORT 1/27/75

Last Monday was request night at the old LSSS meeting. The Senators entertained multiple requests for substantial sums of money, which is not too surprising in light of the fact that the Senate has substantial sums at its disposal. The meeting was distinguished by more than the size of the dollar signs, however, and contrasted starkly with some of the meetings I have witnessed in the past. This one was truly fascinating and generally characterized by positive vibes which may even be felt in the upper reaches of Hutchins Hall before it is all over.

*Joe Fenech (renowned R.G. Ed., but wearing a different hat for the occasion) presented a request for $150 to help out the clinic and got things rolling with some typically witty repartee --- some Senators asked for an itemized budget and Joe replied that if they would come up with the $ he would be happy to do the itemizing... LSSS action on this next meeting.

*Beth Garfield presented a funding request on behalf of the Committee for the National Women and the Law Conference. Funds totaling $3,880 are requested to pay for transportation of 15 Michigan Law women to the National Conference, March 21-23, at Stanford. By way of justification for the request, it was pointed out that Michigan may be selected to host this Conference two years hence; thus, a strong turnout this year by Michigan students is important for two reasons: to assure that Michigan is selected, and to establish a solid base of experienced people with contacts to do the planning and work necessary for such a large conference. The benefits of thorough coverage of Conference activities and dissemination of the information gained to the largest possible number of students here on campus were also mentioned as reasons for sending a large contingent. LSSS action at the next meeting.

*Microwave oven mystery --- Nothing is certain in this Wonderland world, but there is at least a remote possibility that those who frequent the lower reaches of Hutchins may someday be able to warm their sandwiches in the same kind of oven that "Big George" sold.

See LSSS, p.7
CONTEMPT OF COURT COMICS

by Jimmy I.

Judge Parker has just entered the courtroom. All rise, please!

Shouldn't you... um...

Nah! Why should I stand up for that Bozo?

I Object, your Honesty!

For one thing, the prosecuting attorney only got a C+ in criminal law!

You dog! I'll see that your client tries for this!

I can dig it! But I personally think the judge would make a much tastier meal. Yum!

Witnees are called...

Well, I was going to my grandmother's that afternoon and I saw him hide it in the woods...

Hmmm... I'll have to check out those woods sometime.

The defense has clearly won. The judge is not pleased.

Damn humans! Why can't they just keep out of trouble? And he had the nerve to get an animal attorney!

I motion to dismiss is granted, but the judge charges the defendant with contempt of court.

But I didn't even open my mouth during the whole trial.

That's what we lawyers call "mitigating circumstances." Of course, this will cost extra!

It won't be the first time the people have lost a case!

END

I.Q. TEST

Are you smart enough for Law School?

Select A, B, or C!

1. Why did the lawyer cross the road? a. To avoid service b. To cross a state line c. Imputed income is not taxable

2. What do students do in the library? a. Talk to other students b. Put two cushions on their chairs c. Look at other students

3. Where will most law students end up? a. Court b. Jail c. Brazil

Score: 150 for each a, 200 for each b, 250 for each c, 50 extra for all three the same. Did you get in?
cf: to a louse

Res Ipsa has been humbled by our discovery of the following real [yet unbelievable] document which we copied verbatim from a mailing to Saginaw Bar Association members, sent by Mr. Dooz on upon the completion of his term as president of that Bar. This letter was later reprinted in a Saginaw area newspaper. We emphasize again that, unlike much of what Res Ipsa has previously published in this column, this is for real. If this had been submitted by one of our regular contributors, our editorial staff likely would have rejected it as too inherently incredible; we like to remain on this side of the totally preposterous—obviously some others do not follow similar guidelines. Read it and weep.

R.I.

SAGINAW COUNTY BAR PRESIDENT CARL W. DOOZAN

As I close the term my year as President of the Saginaw County Bar, I would like to take this opportunity to stress the need for unity among the members of the Bar.

Today there are so many factors and outside influences which are affecting the welfare of the attorneys that it behooves us to be particularly attentive to our role. The introduction of no-fault legislation has definitely not been beneficial to the Bar. The Supreme Court decisions which permit real estate people to prepare documents has hindered the Bar. The thrust of reformers trying to eliminate the probate of estates under Fifty Thousand Dollars will cause further erosion of legal work for the great majority of the Bar. The use of administrative bodies with non-lawyers representing clients is a further attack upon the welfare of the Bar. The program of pre-paid legal services with a closed panel rather than an open panel is also a current threat. The attempt by the physicians' or crisis committee to limit the fees of attorneys wherever contingent fees are concerned in an inroad into the province of lawyers' welfare.

Our enemies, although we find them without the members of the Bar, are still chiefly members of our own Bar. For instance, the rulings of judges in the past, particularly Supreme Court Judges, demonstrate that these men have no conception of the problems of
to the "Purple Pickle" and the "Happy Tiger." Sounds keen, huh? Meanwhile, however, it seems that Dean Gribble's hands are tied until a mysterious lady who is in some way associated with both the Michigan League and the ARA food vending company comes back from vacation. The company apparently removed the oven after deciding to take out all the food items except soup and yogurt. The motive, as always, was profit (or perhaps loss), and, as always, someone other than the Corporation catches the flak. In this case it has been Gribble who, though inundated by irate calls from law students with cold beef sandwiches, is doing the best he can. Apparently no one missed the food. The LSSS is continuing to follow up this matter and seems bent upon finding a solution in a very short while.

*The BLSA request from last meeting for $400 to underwrite expenses for a fund-raising Ball was approved. This money will be repaid to whatever extent possible from revenues which are not earmarked for African Famine Relief.

*Fred Small, spokesperson for students planning a Conference on Alternative Forms of Practice under the auspices of Section 5, presented a funding request of $2840 for the Conference. The group's objective is to hold a day of presentations and workshops on Saturday, April 5, featuring attorneys and/or representatives from a wide variety of "alternative" practices -- i.e. alternatives to the traditional career channels to which Michigan Law Students are most consistently exposed (corporate law, large firms, judicial clerkships, justice department). It was pointed out that many students desire information on career alternatives such as solo practice, law collectives, public interest law, legal reform organizations, prepaid legal services, special interest advocacy, and public and private agencies of various types. However, such organizations and individuals rarely have the time and resources to send interviewers to law schools. Conference plans include collection and dissemination of information on these types of practice in a post-conference booklet. The potential for individual participants to make contacts which might lead to employment was also noted.

Section 5 people had already approached Dean Pierce and Ms. Krieger of the Placement Office and received enthusiastic support for the project, including clerical, printing, and mailing costs. The Senate voted unanimously to express strong support for the Conference, but appropriated no funds. Several members, in discussion, urged the planners to seek funding from Dean St. Antoine since the purpose of the conference is to provide students with a service which the Law School should probably be doing anyway. It seems that the question of acquainting students with a broader range of career options has been referred to Dean St. Antoine in the past and "taken under advisement." Dean Pierce and Ms. Krieger reportedly indicated to Section 5 members that obstacles to such a project in the past have been the lack of funds and of motivated student workers. Conference planners have already begun to circulate petitions indicating support of the idea and are seeking endorsements from the numerous special interest groups who might be benefitted by the conference. Planning is moving ahead quickly, but definite action cannot be taken until funding is assured. The conference organizers are to open to suggestions concerning the kinds of groups students would like to see represented and to suggestions relating to specific individuals. Any student who is interested in making a suggestion or in participating in the planning and implementation of the conference should contact Sharon Williams or Fred Small and/or watch for publicity and come to a $5 meeting.

*Dean Pierce has communicated to the LSSS an appeal for input from students interested in the proposed new law school building. Reportedly, a tentative design, which many students have seen in the form of a model on display in the Law Club Lounge last fall, has been abandoned (much to the relief of some who saw it). The precise nature and function of the proposed building was not discussed, but someone mentioned that students interested in having space for a day care center in or near the Law Quad may wish to express their position. Anyone interested in having a say about the new building could contact Dean Pierce directly or get in touch with the LSSS committee on the subject.

*Sherry Hour TODAY, Friday, January 31. The problem of workers has been solved-- Hire a caterer!

*Mixer scheduled for Saturday, February 15.
belgium

BRUSSELS FELLOWSHIPS FOR 1975-76

Exchange with Brussels Free University, Belgium for 1975-76, commencing October 1:

One full fellowship available at the French Law Faculty, for a French-speaking Senior at the Law School who will graduate prior to October 1, 1975 (sound ability to understand lectures in French is a prerequisite);

One full fellowship available at the Flemish Law Faculty in the Program on International Legal Cooperation, where the lectures-seminars are given in English. Requirements: graduation from Law School prior to October 1, and reading knowledge of French.

Interested students should see Mrs. Mary B. Gomes (973 Legal Research) as soon as possible; application deadline approximately mid-March 1975. Decisions should be made by late April, 1975.

indian week

The Lawyer's Guild is helping to bring two members of the Wounded Knee Legal Defense/Offense Committee to Ann Arbor. They are Regina Brave Dixon and Bob Yellow Bird. Regina has been indicted for her presence at the Custer Courthouse demonstration. She faces up to 30 years in prison if convicted. Regina is also interested in women's issues. Bob Yellow Bird is the Nebraska coordinator of the American Indian Movement. And, he has been active in prison reform efforts.

They will talk at the Law School on Wednesday, February 5 at 2:00 p.m. in the Lawyers Club Lounge. Refreshments will be provided.

Other American Indian events on campus this week include:

SAT, FEB. 1 (noon-midnight) SUN, FEB. 2 (noon-5pm) POW-WOW U of M UNION BALLROOM, $1-2 Admission, sponsor - NATIVE AMERICAN STUDENT ASSOC.

MON, FEB. 3, 1 pm. "The Indian Movement," Bob Yellow Bird at WASHTENAW COMMUNITY COLLEGE, E.S.B. LECTURE HALL #1 1:30 pm. Interview: "Women and the Indian Movement," Regina Brave Dixon on WPAC RADIO, 1050 AM 107.1 FM

3:00 pm. "The Indian Movement," Regina Brave Dixon Bob Yellow Bird OPEN DISCUSSION at ALLICE LLOYD HALL, PILOT PROGRAM

Main Event - 7:30 pm. "Wounded Knee and the Fort Meigs Treaty" Regina Brave Dixon Bob Yellow Bird Paul Johnson PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY BLDG. # 107 E (between East Univ. & Church, 1/2 block N. of South U.)

4:00 pm. "The Indian Movement," Regina Brave Dixon & Bob Yellow Bird at the SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, 2nd Floor Aud.

8:00 pm. "Indians and the Health Care System" PANEL DISCUSSION, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

LETTUCE

Editor, Res Gestae
Law Library

Dear Sir:

This letter concerns the February 11 election on whether the Law Club should buy lettuce boycotted by the United Farm Workers Union and their supporters.

Some persons have criticized the LSSS for limiting the eligible voting group to Law Club residents and persons with medium- and long-term Law Club board contracts. I submit that this limited constituency is the "real party in interest" in this matter. Those who feel that all law students should vote in the referendum ignore the fact that the Law Club's room and board functions are separate and distinct from the Club's function as an association of all law students. All law students and all residents of the Club have entered into contracts with the University for education, but Club residents and persons with Club meal contracts have entered into separate, additional contracts with the Law Club for room and/or board. Query, whether persons without such additional contracts have a right to interfere with such contracts? The answer to this question may be influenced by the fact that a number of Club residents and holders of meal contracts are not law students and would be disenfranchised in any binding Law School-wide referendum due to long-established Law School election rules.

Aside from the general contractual and procedural problems of a school-wide referendum, I reject on philosophical grounds the position that the residents and customers of the Law Club should be guinea pigs in an experiment designed to satisfy or affirm the political or ideological preferences and sympathies of a group of law students. But if I am to be a guinea pig, then I feel that the decision should be made by the constituency of potential guinea pigs and not by persons who rarely eat at the Law Club and who have the practical option of buying as much iceberg lettuce as they please when they shop for their other grocery needs.

I have two other observations based upon my experiences in previous consideration of the issue:

1) I hope that everyone will conduct a dignified, ethical campaign and will refrain from defacing and removing signs and other materials distributed by the other side.

2) I hope that no one will utilize in this campaign funds appropriated by the LSSS. The referendum is a matter internal to the Law School, and I believe that everyone should observe the principle that government funds are not to be used in elections concerning actions of that government.

As a final note, I ask what may be a rhetorical question: If the UFW is being victimized by unfair practices of the Teamsters and the growers, then why doesn't the UFW actively lobby for extension to farm workers of the protections and procedures of the National Labor Relations Act? Perhaps because secondary boycotts such as the "lettuce boycott" are illegal unfair labor practices under the NLRA?

s/Barry F. White
(individually and not as Food Czar)

LETTUCE: WHY THE VOTE?

On Tuesday, February 11, the residents of the Lawyer's Club will vote to decide if the law school should join the UFW boycott of certain lettuce. The issue has already caused a great deal of dissention, and I would like to explain why we are having the vote and what I think will come of it.

Last term, several members of the LSSS raised the boycott question, expressing dismay and even disgust at our apparent callousness to the plight of the farmworkers. Other Senate members replied that the same issue had been raised last year, and that only after much argument was our present policy adopted as a compromise. Many students had wanted to join the boycott last year; others had opposed the idea. So Food Services was told that UFW-approved lettuce should be purchased whenever possible, and that some brand of UFW approved lettuce should always be served. Many of the club residents, however, preferred iceberg let-
tupe, and Food Services informed us that UFW-approved was not always available. Michigan iceberg lettuce is not under the boycott; in September when it is available there is no problem. But the rest of the year, iceberg must be shipped from California, and the law school can not buy in large enough lots to have it shipped out specially. During the four months from October to January last year, UFW-approved iceberg lettuce was available only three days. Thus, the iceberg lettuce served at meals is usually not UFW-approved, and those who eat it are violating the boycott.

Many people, however, said that anyone who eats in a cafeteria where non-UFW lettuce is served is violating the boycott, because their money goes to buy the "scab" lettuce. Whether the money of a club resident who doesn't eat lettuce actually goes to pay for it is a moot question; but lettuce is bought on the basis of consumption, and it is undeniable that non-UFW iceberg lettuce is eaten at a rate four to five times that of UFW lettuce. The non-UFW lettuce is clearly marked as such—the people who eat it know they are going against the boycott, and are doing so voluntarily.

Of course, not all students eat lettuce, and the many who boycott all lettuce are not reflected in the 4:1 ratio. Food Services could not tell us how many people actually eat non-UFW lettuce. So the Senate decided to put the question to a vote. Every Lawyer's Club resident will be asked whether or not he thinks the law school should join the boycott. If the vote passes, then iceberg lettuce will not be served most of the time. If the boycott is voted down, we will not keep the present policy of having both kinds available.

If we do keep the old policy, we will be the only dorm at U of M serving non-UFW lettuce. That fact casts a certain reflection upon all of us, whether we live in the Club or not. Some people thought that all students should vote on this issue, but the LSSS-in its' decrived wisdom-said that only Club residents' money goes to purchase the lettuce and they are the only ones who will be giving up something if the boycott passes. So they should be the only ones to vote. It is still a debatable question.

It is undeniable, however, that the vote will reflect upon all of us in some way, whether we live in the Club or not. The boycott has become a symbol as well as an economic weapon. Supporting the boycott means you support a certain morality, a certain ethical position. At the beginning, it was the right of migrant farmworkers to a decent wage, adequate housing and healthy working and living conditions. Now, after several years, it has turned more toward the right of workers to have union representation of their choice. Much of the UFW boycotted lettuce is picked by union workers who belong to rival unions of the UFW. The boycott is now the only weapon Chavez has against lettuce growers who are trying to strip him of his power and bring in the less militant (?) Teamsters. The UFW says that all the gains the farmworkers have made will disappear in a few years unless their union negotiates with the owners. Perhaps they are right.

But the issue is not really whether the UFW or the Teamsters pick the lettuce we buy. The question is whether every student should make an individual decision to support the boycott or not every time he scoops up a dish of lettuce, or whether we should present a united front with the rest of the University and ban the tainted greens from our doorstep altogether. It will be a vote that measures our morality, in a real sense but the issues run quite a bit deeper than whether we are "dooming farmworkers to a sub-human existence" by our vote. Basically, we asking whether we want to be counted as members of an institution, with dissenting viewpoints bent to the rule of the majority or whether we want to be counted as individuals. That's the way I see it.

S/Bill Hays
As law students we've been thrust into a demanding environment. Competition, a heavy academic workload, family and social pressures, to name just a few of the demands, all tend to produce a lot of stress. Our ability to succeed in law school (and in "real life" as well) depends on our ability to meet these demands. Recent studies have shown that Transcendental Meditation (TM) may be one very effective way of becoming more capable of dealing with such an environment by making us more capable in general as human beings (a shared level of existence more basic than that of being "law students").

TM is a simple, natural, effortless technique practiced twice daily for about 20 minutes. During these 20 minutes, the meditator sits in a comfortable position with the eyes closed. Meditators claim that it provides deep rest and relaxation to the mind and body, thereby unfolding greater energy, creativity, and mental potential. The practice involves no religious or philosophical belief and requires no change of lifestyle.

Until recently, many people were skeptical of meditators' claims of increased energy, clarity of mind, emotional stability and overall feelings of self-worth. However, since the initial studies done at U.C.L.A. and Harvard Medical School in 1970-71, a convincing body of physiological, psychological, and sociological data has been compiled showing that TM results in very real and lasting beneficial changes.

Researchers found that during TM oxygen consumption spontaneously decreases about 16%, indicating a state of deep rest. This reduction is almost twice that observed during deep sleep. Heart and breath rates decreased correspondingly. The concentration of blood lactate (a chemical which has been associated with anxiety neurosis, anxiety attacks and high blood pressure) markedly decreases. More recent brain wave research has shown that while the body is experiencing a state of remarkably deep rest, the mind exhibits an increasingly alert and orderly pattern of functioning. This unique style of functioning of the human mind and body, qualitatively different from the waking, dreaming and sleeping states, has been called a state of "restful alertness."

The result of regularly experiencing this state of deep physical rest combined with the alert, orderly functioning of the mind is a cumulative growth in the qualities necessary to deal more effectively with everyday demands. With greater energy, clarity of mind and an increased ability to focus on the task at hand, studying tends to be more productive. Because TM is a natural way of reducing stress and increasing inner stability, the pressures of competition, family and social expectations, or 20th century existence in general are dealt with more easily and effectively.

Thus, both research and personal experience have shown TM to be an effective tool for preparing the individual to lead a most satisfying life. Contrary to some popular notions about meditation being a passivity-inducing practice, TM is done as a preparation for more fulfilling activity. Realizing our full potential as human beings is a natural and necessary precedent to leading fulfilled lives whatever our goals may be.

This rather brief introduction to TM may have raised more questions than it's answered. That is part of its purpose. I invite those who are interested in hearing more about TM to come to a discussion to be held on Thursday, February 6th at 7:30 p.m. in Law Club. I plan to discuss TM as it relates to the student and legal community in general, and also recent research done at Stillwater Prison in Minnesota, the Federal Correctional Institution at La Tuna, Texas and other institutions where TM has been used very successfully as a rehabilitative technique.

S/Jim Zatolokin
Teacher of Transcendental Meditation
On Friday, January 31, the Law School Film Series will present *Monkey Business* with the Marx Bros. We will also show three old Warner Bros. cartoons featuring Daffy Duck, Tweety & Sylvester, and Yosemite Sam. The showtimes will be 7:00 and 8:45 P.M. in Room 100, Hutchins Hall. Law students are admitted free, non-law students are charged $1.00.

NOTE: Anyone interested in taking over the helm of the Law School Film Series for the 1975-76 school year, please call Rick Kaminsky at 764-9073, or stop by room 0-33 of the lawyers Club. Interested parties would be responsible for both picking the films and running the projectors on Friday nights. With two new projectors to work with, the job shouldn't be the hassle it has been in the past.
BASKETBALL POLL

Bob Jerry won the poll last week with a record of 13-7. The overall percentage was .522.

It appears that there is only one excellent team this year--Indiana. They now lose three league games and still clinch at least a tie for the Big Ten Championship. Michigan, Minnesota, Purdue, and Ohio State are all 5-3. It now looks very doubtful that the eventual second-place team will receive a NCAA bid.

Auburn (7½) at Alabama
Arizona St. (4½) at Arizona
Fordham (8½) at Boston College
Stanford at California (1¼)
Providence (5½) at Canisius
North Carolina (½) at Clemson
Marquette (½) at DePaul
Hawaii (20½) at Oregon
South Carolina (½) at Houston
Michigan St. at Illinois (5½)
Indiana at Ohio St. (13½)
Iowa (4½) at Wisconsin
Kansas at Kansas St. (2½)
Mississippi St. (8½) at Kentucky
LaSalle at Syracuse (8½)
North Texas St. (16½) at Louisville
Maryland (3½) at NC State
Michigan (10½) at Purdue
Minnesota at Northwestern (10½)
UCLA (½) at Southern Cal

Tiebreaker:
How many points will Southern Cal score against UCLA?

NAME

RG RANKINGS

1 Indiana (7) 11 Arizona St.
2 Louisville 12 Oregon
3 NC State 13 Arizona
4 UCLA 14 Marquette
5 Kentucky 15 Auburn
6 LaSalle 16 Creighton
7 Alabama 17 Tennessee
8 Maryland 18 Oregon St.
9 Southern Cal 18 South Carolina
10 North Carolina 20 Bradley
20 Michigan
20 Nevada--L.V.
20 Notre Dame

(TamE)

I do hope that in the future years the statesmen of the Bar will be able to sell the membership upon this dire need for legislative action and that we will have a commitment from our members to some type of political action committee whose interests will be the general welfare of the Bar rather than any particular group.

I appreciate the opportunity of serving you in the past year and hope that the Bar prospers in the future.

Carl W. Doozan
President

(LSSS)

*President Terry Linderman reported on the activities of an ad hoc group of presidents from the student governments of the various colleges and schools, and received the LSSS's endorsement to continue to represent it at the meetings of this group. This coalition has been formed for the purpose of advocating reform of the Student Government Council (SGC) as recommended by the Report of the Commission to Study Student Government. The latter body was apparently formed at the behest of the Regents in the wake of massive corruption and miserable ineffectiveness in the SGC. How many law students voted in the SGC election last fall? How many even knew there was an election? How many contributed $ to the SGC through a mandatory fee? If you know or can even guess the answer to the last question, it should make you wonder about the first two.

*As a sidelight to the SGC discussion, it was noted that the LSSS is regarded as the most advanced of the school and college governments on the campus. The size of the budget and extent of influence in faculty decision-making were cited as areas in which LSSS is superior. Even the LSSS members were a little astounded at this revelation.

*The meeting ended with a whimper as the Senate struggled in a committee-of-the-whole to iron out some procedural kinks in the rules for the referendum on the lettuce boycott.

S/George Vinyard