Third year students -
The ABA has a new program which may prove helpful to students looking for jobs this Spring. Called JURISCAN it is a computer matching system. Applications are available in our office or outside room 100.

Please let us know if you have taken a job. If you have not, please fill out a yellow form so that we can decide where we stand, and how we should proceed to maximize our efforts this Spring.

Interview with Solloway, Hollis, Godfrey & Soden; Concord, NH. - For 3rd year people. Will be coming February 26th. Please come in and sign-up for an interview.

The Harvard Survey of Public Interest groups is coming. The first installment has arrived, and we will be getting more all of the time.

The faculty Law Review Committee will soon look into the question of membership standards for the Law Review. Since this question concerns not only present members of the Review but also potential members and the law school community in general, I would like to solicit the opinions of any interested law students, first through third years. In the interest of efficiency, I would appreciate receiving statements or opinions in writing. No particular degree of formality is necessary. Statements should be sent to 1033 Legal Research by Friday, February 21. After statements are received, the committee will meet to discuss various suggestions. It will consult with the Review, the Journal, and other interested parties, and may also call on some of those who submitted statements, especially those whose statements contained ideas substantially different from those contributed by other sources.

Jim Martin
Chairman, Law Review Committee

There will be a men's bake sale Thursday, Feb. 20 and Fri., Feb. 21. The proceeds will be used to help pay the transportation expenses of women going to The National Women and the Law Conference in San Francisco. If you can contribute baked goods and/or time, please call Art Waters (994-5509) or Don Shaw (769-3235).

SUSAN B. ANTHONY DINNER

The potluck dinner in honor of Susan B. Anthony's birthday is Saturday at 7 p.m. Call Ann Peterson 662-4611 or Christie Peterson 663-9589 for food assignments.

TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION

--A REMINDER--

For those who attended the first lecture on Transcendental Meditation, the second (preparatory) lecture will be given on Thursday, February 20, at 7:30 p.m. in the Cook Room, Lawyer's Club § N. Course dates are: February 22-25 (Saturday - Tuesday).

REFERENDUM RESULTS

"Should the Lawyers Club stop buying lettuce boycotted by the United Farm Workers
---------- Yes or No"
Yes 123 votes 41.41%
No 174 votes 58.58%
Abstentions or Contested ballots 4 (to be decided by the LSS Senate)
Therefore, the motion does not pass.

LSSS Election Committee

FRIDAY, FEB. 14 (3:30 p.m.-4:30 p.m.)
CHESTERFIELD SMITH, immediate President of American Bar Association will be speaking in the Law Club Lounge. General question-answer format.

SPONSOR: Law School Student Senate
Speakers Committee

CONTACT: Buck Schott 764-9000
[Editor's Note: Larry Moloney is a third year law student and Academic Director of the Pilot Program, a living-learning program for undergraduates. He welcomes response to the article by mail, by phone, or in person. He may be contacted at Box 7068, 100 Observatory St. Ann Arbor, 764-1177.]

E.M. Forster, in Passage to India, speaks of the Malabar Caves where all speech is transformed into a meaningless inconsequential echo: "If one had spoken with the tongues of angels and pleaded for all the unhappiness and misunderstanding in the world, past, present, and to come, for all the misery men must undergo whatever their opinion and position, it all ambunted to the same ou-boum.

Such would seem to be the fate of speech advocating protection of the unborn. In the abortion controversy, one noisy volley of rhetoric evokes only the shallow position in all too many cases, leaving all parties untouched, deafened, and secure in their original position. The apparent futility of speech in this controversy seems to give support to moral relativists who dismiss the possibility of objective moral right relating to this issue or any other, and point us toward the comfortable position espoused by Peanuts, among others: "It doesn't matter what you believe as long as you're sincere." Let each live undisturbed within his own moral standards.

But upon consideration, speech directed toward the abortion issue is neither an unwarranted intrusion upon others nor futile. For one would have to raise the value of toleration to an absolute to say that moral objections are not called for where the possibility of murder is the issue. I can never understand those people who ask me what right I have to make judgment on the woman's right to abort. I stand on the same right that these objectors would presumably call upon were a woman to made the decision to end her child's life after birth, the right to object to an unjust or immoral act in the hope of checking the
**MOVIE**

Friday, February 14, the Law School Film Series will present *The Pawnbroker*, starring Rod Steiger and directed by Sidney Lumet. Showtimes are 7 and 9 PM. Admission is free for law students and $1.00 for non-law. The show will take place in room 100, Hutchins Hall.

---

**BARRISTERS** will meet Friday, Feb. 14 at the University Club from 4-6 p.m. All members please attend. Selection of new members will take place from 4-5:30 p.m. This will be the last opportunity to select new members.

---

**THIRD YEAR STUDENTS (2nd, TOO)**

First year students looking for 5-6 bedroom house vacant next year. We need your help! Please call if you’re leaving one or know someone who is. Call any time and keep trying.

Thanks.

764-2010 764-2013
764-8918 764-9049

---

**GUILD GENERAL MEETING **

**MONDAY 17 FEB**

8:00 Law Club Lounge

---

**LSSS REPORT 2/10/75**

This observer of LSSS doing was co-opted Monday night by a Senate resolution recognizing my report as the official minutes since the secretary did not attend the meeting and I was “doing it anyway.” So here are the unadorned, “official” minutes; the comments come next week.

**MINUTES OF THE LAW SCHOOL STUDENT SENATE, FEBRUARY 10, 1975**

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:00 PM by President Terry Linderman.

Doug Wallace and Jim Rogers, two of the three student members on the Committee on Academic Standards reported on the activities of that committee and the Law School Faculty. The Faculty has reportedly changed the J.D. requirement to "52 hours beyond the first year." This change is retro-spective insofar as it applies to all students currently enrolled except that no student will be granted a degree with less than a total of 80 hours of credit. The faculty passed a committee proposal to permit the election vel non of pass-fail for a course at any time up to the last two weeks of classes, but an amendment to the proposal added a provision that individual faculty members be permitted to obtain Curriculm Committee approval for designating specified courses as unavailable for pass/fail enrollemt. Such designation would be contingent upon a showing of some sort of academic rationale relating to course methods and objectives. Finally, the Committee on Academic Standards was report- ed to have promulgated a proposal for prohibiting faculty access to student transcripts without the consent of the student. This proposal has been debated and amended by the faculty but not yet acted upon.

Future items to be considered by the Standards Committee include policy guidelines governing special examinations for individual students (when appropriate, timing, grading, etc), and possible restrictions on late withdrawals.

The Senate unanimously adopted the following resolutions relating to the report from
You know, Sam, I really am disappointed with my grades so far. I really ought to spend more time with the books.

I don't know, Argie, I haven't seen any direct correlation between work and grades.

Besides, grades are no reliable indication of ability at this level, and the extra work couldn't be worth it.

You may be right, but I'm gonna try it.

That term... Argie Ant here again? Nii... still here?

Mr. Ant, do you think you could do us the courtesy of staying awake in class?

Zzzz... huh?

Let's see, Calamari says yes, Corbin says no. A.L.I. First says maybe, A.L.I. Second says it's no longer relevant.

Of course, the real answer is to weigh the fairness against the state's interest.

Exams... If x, then not y, but if not x then maybe a, b, c or j...

Grade time...

You're kidding!

Next term...

You know, Sam, I don't really think grades are a realistic gauge of performance at this level.

Besides that, I don't really see any correlation between grades and understanding of basic concepts... but anyway, I know where there's a great party this weekend...
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called History of the Male, or Males of the Bible, or The Psychology of the Male, and he would be regaled daily with headlines, such as "Gentleman-Doctor's Discovery," "Male Secretary Wins Calcutta Sweep," "Men Artists at the Academy."

If he gave an interview to a reporter, or performed any unusual exploit, he would find it recorded in such terms as these: "Professor Bract, although a distinguished botanist, is not in any way an unmanly man. He has, in fact, a wife and seven children. Tall and burly, the hands with which he handles his delicate specimens are as gnarled and powerful as those of a Canadian lumberjack, and when I swilled beer with him in his laboratory, he bawled his conclusions at me in a strong, gruff voice that implemented the promise of his swaggering moustache." Or: "There is nothing in the least feminine about the home surroundings of Mr. Focus, the famous children's photographer. His 'den' is paneled in teak and decorated with rude sculptures from Easter Island; over his austere iron bedstead hangs a fine reproduction of the Rape of the Sabines." Or: "I asked Mr. Sapristi, the renowned chef, whether kitchen-cult was not a rather unusual occupation for a man. 'Not a bit of it!' he replied, bluffly. 'It is the genius that counts, not the sex. As they say in La belle Ecosse, a man's a man for a' that' - and his gusty, manly guffaw blew three small patty pans from the dresser."

He would be edified by solemn discussions about "Should Men Serve in Drapery Establishments?" and acrimonious ones about "Tea Drinking Men"; by cross-shots of public affairs "from the masculine angle," and by irritable correspondence about men who expose their anatomy on beaches also masculine of them), conceal it in dressing gowns (too feminine of them), think about nothing but women, pretend an unnatural indifferance to women, exploit their sex to get jobs, lower the tone of the office by their sexless appearance, and generally fail to please a public opinion which demands the incompatible. And at dinner parties he would hear the wheedling unctuous, predatory female voice demand: "And why should you trouble your handsome little head about politics?"

If, after a few centuries of this kind of treatment, the male was a little self-conscious, a little on the defensive, and a little bewildered about what was required of him, I should not blame him. If he traded a little upon his sex, I could forgive him. If he presented the world with a major social problem, should scarcely be surprised. It would be more surprising if he retained any rag of sanity and self-respect.

Dorothy L. Sayers
[From Unpopular Opinions]
S/Ann Peterson
The Michigan Law Review and Journal of Law Reform are jointly sponsoring a Freshman Writing Program. Each publication will independently judge the entries and issue invitations for membership. Writers who are chosen by both publications will be asked to make a choice between the two. The Journal of Law Reform will continue its practice of inviting First-Year students and 1974 Summer-Starters to submit writing samples, such as Case-Club briefs, memoranda, papers, etc. at a date to be announced for further consideration. The Journal will, however, give priority to entrants in the Joint Program when allocating staff positions.

The Program will begin February 17, 1975. All entries must be in by 5:00 p.m. on June 13, 1975. Each writer will be allowed three weeks from the date on which he or she chooses a topic to complete the paper.

Fifteen topics relating to the areas of the law that are covered in first year courses have been chosen. Applicants will be allowed to choose a topic from among five of these 15 topics. The five available topics will be changed each day during the Program. Every attempt will be made to have the five available topics cover differing areas of the law. An applicant will be allowed 24 hours in which to choose a topic from among the five. The three-week period will begin from the date the topic is chosen.

Topics will be available in Room 410 HH from 4:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m. Monday-Friday. Ask for Mary Lou Fellows.

Students are free to discuss research and writing problems with designated members of the two journals during the course of their work. Chip Eady, Bob Thomson, and John Stevens will be available for con-

As had been his wont to do for the last fifteen years, Teddy St. Unwound rose promptly at 5:15 a.m. His first activity was to polish the Triple Crown hanging above his bed.

"Ah, reminisced Teddy as he buffed the silver trophy with chamois, First in class '54, Campbell Competition Winner '53, Editor-in-Chief of Law Review '54..."

Teddy treasured his triple crown. In fact, the only time he had parted with it was when the then-attempting-to-unionize-clericals purloined it and held it for ransom in retaliation for his "captive audience" speech.

Heavy snow had fallen during the night. St. Unwound peered out the window to see if any of it had dared to settle in front of his house.

"It's good to see Mrs. Betts shoveling the walk", he said to himself, "I'm tired of having bottom-halfers botch it up!"

The next item on the itinerary was the morning bathroom ritual. Teddy's whiskers disappeared by fiat. A splash of "Wigmore on Evidence Cologne" was sufficient sprucing.
At breakfast he went over the prospective schedule for the day:

"Let's see, at 8:00 I meet with the Law Revue editors."

"At 9:30 the Law Revue Committee to Determine the Color of the Law Review Cover comes in to have me choose between dip-shit brown, and latrine green."

"At 10:00 Erica and I go dancing at Arthur Murray's."

"11:00--The Law Revue Committee on Committees comes in. Ellen and I discuss the merits of Aristotle's feud with Xenocrates--an outstanding fellow."

"(top secret) Me and Yale Kamisar go to Dale Carnegie's for counseling at 11:30."

"12:00 I have lunch with the Law Review staff. We go to Weber's--they pay."

"3:00 Discuss petition to squash "flea" and terminate Res Gestae's existence."

"4:00 Afternoon tea with Barb, Mary Lou, and Mark."

"Dear, said Mrs. Unwound, don't you think you should spend some of your time with the other students?"

"What other students?"

"Those not on the Revue."

"What! I didn't know there were any!"

After calming down, Teddy rang for his transportation. Six botton half students came running. The dean stepped into a carriage which the botton halfers hoisted onto their shoulders. The daily trip to the law school had commenced.
To The Editor:

Dear Argie,

For all of your readers who believe that status seeking in the law is on the wane, I most humbly submit a living piece, in the clever disguise of a rejection. When the H.L.S. spider says "Buzz off, scum", you know you've been cut. Entomologists, take note.

S/ Marty Newman

Martin E. Newman
35029 East Michigan Avenue
Wayne, Michigan 48184

Dear Mr. Newman:

I am in receipt of your correspondence of January 8, 1975. Unfortunately, we do not anticipate taking on any additional personnel in the near future as we have recently hired a graduate of the 1974 class of Harvard Law School. I do, however, thank you for your interest in this office.

Very truly yours,

Ronald E. Oliveira

REO/san

A Letter To The Editors of the Res Gestae.

Dear Sirs,

Although I am not normally in the habit of cluttering the pages of the Res Gestae with my own obtuse views on the various issues of the day, a certain anomalous situation has become apparent to me via the pages of last week's Res Gestae, causing me to break stride, ponder, and then scribble down this (hopefully) brief effusion of personal opinion. My reference is to two contributions to last week's Res Gestae. The first opus referred to is the LSSS Report on p. 8. In this report it is noted that the Student Senate has made the following allocations of funds:

1) $800 for a micro-wave oven, security chain and "plaque" for the basement of Hutchins Hall and
2) A total of $1,216 for funding for transportation for women attending the Sixth National Conference on Women and the Law.

Permit me to note, in all fairness to the proponents of these allocations, that my knowledge of the merits of these two projects is confined entirely to what I have learned through my usual hurried perusal of the Res Gestae during Professor Reed's Evidence class. I have no special know-

The boycott forces have made great efforts over the course of this debate to educate the law school community on this issue. Caught up in the heat of the moment, many of those opposed to the boycott have rejected much of that information. I sincerely hope that now, as the emotionalism of the campaign dissipates, every student will pause to reevaluate his/her position, and make sure that his/her decision is rational, educated, and truly reflects his/her personal values. We cannot retain individual freedom if we do not exercise it with the common good in mind.

S/Terrence G. Linderman
President, LSSS

THE BIG "T"

The lettuce referendum is finally over, and hopefully we can now move on to other issues. Before we do, I would like to make one final comment. The referendum, by a substantial margin, reaffirmed the freedom of the individual to make his own decision on a political issue. I personally hold this individual freedom as the highest ideal of human society. However, with this freedom comes responsibility, in this case the responsibility to make these choices wisely, based on a rational study of the issues beyond our own personal whims. Surely this is not too much to ask of students at a major law school.
ledge of these two projects, am not in a position to debate their respective merits and demerits, and acknowledge that, as they appear in the *Res Gestae*, they present a prima facie case of merit and worthiness. I have no quarrel with these projects as such, and the allocations for them, absent any extraneous influences, would not have led to the writing of this letter. Allow me also to note that if these allocations had never been made I personally would have suffered no loss thereby. I am not one of the women attending the conference, nor am I addicted to the use of the microwave ovens (my pacemaker would never stand for it). Accordingly, I am comfortably ensconced in the happy position of being able to freely criticize these allocations, secure in the knowledge that none of my personal sacred oxen will be gored should they be rescinded. This admittedly makes it easier for me to criticize these allocations than it would be if I were more directly involved in either of the projects.

Having now laid the foundation for my argument, let me proceed to introduce the "villain" of this piece. I refer to a second article in last week's *Res Gestae*, a letter written by Mr. Julian Bond, President of the Southern Poverty Law Center, appearing on p.9. In this letter Mr. Bond briefly outlined the plight of a young girl named Joanne Little. Briefly, he told of how Joanne, a Black girl who had spent the previous three months in jail awaiting action on her appeal of a dubious prior conviction, was sexually assaulted by a white jailer early on the morning of August 27, 1974. Joanne succeeded in using his own weapon, an ice pick, to stab him several times while fighting off his attack. Then, frightened by the probable consequences of her self-defense, she fled the jail. Unfortunately, the wounds she had inflicted on her assailant proved to be mortal. After hiding out for some time, she surrendered to the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation. Despite the obvious defensive motives for her actions, she has been charged with first-degree homicide, a capital offense in North Carolina, and will stand trial in a few weeks.

When one compares Mr. Bond's letter to the LSSS Report, certain contrasts emerge. Mr. Bond emphasizes in his letter that Joanne Little is indigent and in desperate need of funds, that she is being represented by two attorneys who are charging no fee for their services, that she is being tried on an excessive charge in a state notorious for the injustices that it perpetrates upon Black persons, and she is at present especially in need of the services of a criminologist to investigate her case and provide her with the evidence she needs to defend herself. He notes the many vital issues that are present in her case:
1) The saving of her life; 2) The establishment of the right of women everywhere to defend themselves against sexual attack by the use of force; 3) The growing evidence of a consistent pattern of sexual abuse of female inmates by male guards and trustees in penal institutions throughout our nation; 4) "The discriminatory use of the death penalty against poor people and blacks; 5) Jury selection processes which fail to produce juries or true peers" (few black people serve on juries in the court in which Joanne is being tried); and 6) The
the members of the Academic Standards Committee:

RESOLVED: That transcripts should not be available to faculty members without the express permission of the student.

RESOLVED: That the Senate is opposed to a policy permitting individual faculty members to designate course unavailable for pass/fail.

RESOLVED: That the Senate commends the work of the members of the Committee on Academic Standards.

Next, the Senate members, realizing that the Secretary was absent, passed a resolution to the effect that the report of the meeting by George Vinyard would constitute the official minutes.

A note of thanks to the Senate for its support in sending representatives to the National Women and the Law Conference was received from the Fundraising Committee for the National Women and the Law Conference and read to the body. It said in part: "We hope that we will be good representatives of University of Michigan Law Students at the Conference and prove successful in communicating information about the conference when we return."

A followup report on the funding request for items related to the clinical law program revealed that the individuals involved disclaimed any difficulties in getting necessary funding through the appropriate administrative channels, i.e. the Dean. The request was altered to include only $45 for a coffee machine, which was deemed a convenience and not essential to the clinical curriculum and thus an appropriate item for LSSS funding. The Senate approved the $45 allocation.

A report on the progress of plans for a Gilbert and Sullivan play, TRIAL BY JURY, resulted in a decision to charge no admission fee to non-law students since the expense for rental of the theatre facility in East Quad is to be contingent upon admission charges. Law Students will have priority in allocation of the free tickets. A special performance is planned for the Washtenaw County Bar Association, and a printed program is being financed through the sale of advertisements. Excess revenues from these sources are to be used for receptions for the audiences and a cast party.

Someone announced that the schedule conflict between the Mixer and the Susan B. Anthony Potluck Dinner reflected no animosity on the part of those scheduling the latter event and was merely a coincidence.

A report on the microwave oven situation revealed that the ARA food vending company has been prevailed upon to reinstate both the oven and the food in Hutchins. The necessity of the Senate purchasing an oven was thus removed.

The treasurer is investigating the matter of repairing the piano in the Lawyers Club Lounge and will report back.

A representative of the Barristers Society reported on plans for the traditional Crease Ball, requesting permission to use the Senate’s name in publicity as co-sponsor in order to emphasize the fact that the Ball is open to all members of the Law School Community. Since the Senate is providing a guarantee against expenses but not actually sponsoring the event, the request was denied. The event, which is tentatively scheduled for April 5, was described as a "dressy but not too formal dance." The admission is tentatively planned to be somewhat less than the $6 per couple charged last year. A further report will be forthcoming as plans progress.

\[\text{(\#LSSS 12/12)}\]
It was noted that the broken ping-pong table in the LC recreation room had been mysteriously fixed at some time in the past weeks with no expenditure of LSSS money.

The success of the BLSA was noted.

Substantial discussion of campaign tactics in the lettuce boycott referendum ultimately resulted in no Senate Action. Apparently some anonymous member of the anti-boycott forces was refused service by the University Cellar copy center on the grounds of the substantive content of the anti-boycott material he/she wished to have duplicated. Subsequently, the individual in question caused to be printed and circulated the original copy and an additional note which, by way of innuendo, hinted that the pro-boycott forces might have had some involvement in the decision of the U. Cellar personnel. The consensus appeared to be that the Senate should neither censure the U. Cellar nor the inappropriate campaign tactics of the anonymous party whose First Amendment rights (all agreed) had been violated by the former's refusal to print. There seemed to be agreement that the LSSS might confront the issue with U. Cellar, if the anonymous party were to reveal himself, verify the allegations, and ask that his representatives vindicate his rights. In the course of discussion it was noted that the refusal of service was probably a breach of contract in addition to a violation of constitutional rights since every student is required to invest $5 in the U Cellar at the time of enrollment.

In further action related to the lettuce boycott referendum, the Senate voted to permit Lawyers Club employees (including maintenance staff and part-time student employees) to vote in the referendum provided that a valid list of the employees could be procured in time for the balloting. A further provision of the same motion called for adequate notice of their enfranchisement (if any) to be communicated to the said employees. The rationale for this action was that the employees eat a substantial number of meals in the dining hall, but do not buy tickets in blocks and thus were not included in the earlier definition of the electorate.

Discussion during and after the meeting was devoted to the procedures and safeguards to be employed in conducting the voting and counting the ballots. LSSS members will operate the polls, working in teams of two comprised of one pro-boycott person and one anti-boycott person. Members of the Senate Elections committee will count the ballots and record and post the results, with Senate members permitted as observers of the counting process.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:55 PM.

Respectively Submitted--
George Vinyard
By Stan Ford

The classic law student is loud, aggressive, self-assured verging on the obnoxious. Only a few of us fit the Horatio Alger-as-a-loudmouth-syndrome: most of us land in that vast arena between the fulsome and the painfully shy.

The following interview sounds out the experience of those law students who fall into the "shy" category. It is a short interview befitting the views of someone not comfortable revealing herself to the law school community. Shyness like most human behavior is situational. The back rows of Hutchins Hall are filled with folks willing and able to project their "selves", outside of the Hutch.

There is something about the law school that stops them from coming forward. Idiot winds blow in the halls. Kelly S. is a tall woman with a drooping smile. She graduates this Winter. Although she never spoke voluntarily in class her grades put the rest of us to shame. She now works for a law firm in the Detroit-Ann Arbor cultural axis:

Q. Why did you come to Michigan?
A. I don't really know. In state tuition and it is better than Wayne State.

Q. How do you feel about the awards you won here?
A. They're not worth much. Though I appreciated the case club award. I worked for that. Everyone needs some reinforcement.

Q. What was your undergraduate major and how does it fit into your future plans?
A. Economics, but it really didn't help. My goal is to be an employed lawyer. That's hard now. We'll see what kind of latitude there is then.

Q. I've noticed that you always wear pants. Why?
A. I have ugly legs. They're comfortable.

---

PIRGIM ANNOUNCES

STUDENTS CAN BE ON STATE AGENCY BOARDS,

Have you ever wanted to be one of the State boards that are supposed to regulate professions and enforce licensing laws? Do you want to be in a position to do something about funeral directors that sell luxurious caskets to grieving families who can't afford them, collection agencies that plague debtors mercilessly, employment agencies that discriminate against women and blacks, hearing aid dealers that sell expensive devices to people who won't benefit from them?

For the first time, it's possible. Until 1974, only the Veterinary Medicine board had a member who wasn't from the profession being regulated. In the past legislative session, bills were passed to add one or more public members to 17 more boards. None have yet been appointed, but Governor Milliken is expected to begin appointing them by late February.

PIRGIM released today a memorandum it has sent to its student leadership and other consumer organization leadership through the state, communicating an invitation from Governor Milliken to suggest public members for these 17 boards. The only qualification, besides being seriously interested, is not being a member of the profession or occupation the board regulates.

THE PIRGIM memo:

Last year the legislature approved bills to add public members to many of the 32 boards in the Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulation. In a recent conversation, Bill Rustem of Governor Milliken's office invited suggestions of persons to fill those positions. The Governor is likely to fill the vacancies in late February or early March, so suggestions should be sent by early February.

No one should overestimate the importance of these positions; in most cases, the public member will be only one person out of a board membership which otherwise represents the regulated industry or profession. But we shouldn't underestimate the importance either, for one concerned, alert, articulate,
right of indigents to an adequate defense. Mr. Bond points out that the Southern Poverty Law Center is aiding Joanne's defense financially to the best of its ability; however, its resources are apparently insufficient to meet all the necessary expenses, because of the Center's prior commitments to other important cases. He accordingly asks each of us to contribute as much as we are able to this vital cause. In contrast to Mr. Bond's letter stands the LSSS Report's dry notation of the allocation of a combined total of over $2,000 for the purposes of purchasing a new micro-wave oven for Hutchins Hall and sending a delegation of women law students to the Sixth National Conference on Women and the Law. Now, these are certainly worthwhile projects, but are they as vitally important as the cause Mr. Bond represents to us? Do they strike your eye as being of the same magnitude of importance as are the issues in Joanne Little's case? If we do not purchase a micro-wave oven this year, certainly we can purchase one next year. If we send a reduced delegation or no delegation at all, to this year's conference, we can still send one to next year's conference. The proponents of these projects are surely not going to die if they do not receive these allocations. Unfortunately, the same thing cannot be said for Joanne Little: She goes on trial in a few weeks on a capital charge, with her very life itself at stake.

Under these circumstances, is it not wiser, more generous, to contribute this $2,000 of excess funds the Senate seems to find itself blessed with to the cause of one frightened young girl, fighting for her life against the power of the prosecutorial system of an entire State? I hope that the proponents of the two allocations I have spoken of will agree with me on this issue and voluntarily offer to allow the rescission of these allocations and their contribution to the defense of Joanne Little. In any event, I intend to suggest this step to the Law Student Senate next Monday, if I am permitted to do so; I hope that those of you who agree with my point of view will come to next Monday's Senate meeting and give your support as I sally in to beard the denizens of the Faculty Dining Room in their own den. I will be grateful for any support received.

Sincerely,

Edward P. Arrizabalaga
and persistent consumer representative can at least keep shady deals from being concocted and can blow the whistle when a board threatens to act against the public good. Besides, it might be fun.

The positions, which pay only travel costs and usually involve one meeting a month in Lansing are now open for the following boards (the number in parenthesis is the number of public members to be appointed):

- Architects (1)
- Land Surveyors (1)
- Barbers (1)
- Marriage counselors (1)
- Builders (3)
- Mortuary science (1)
- Chiropractic (1)
- Nursing (1)
- Collection Agencies (2)
- Osteopathic (1)
- Community Planners (3)
- Pharmacy (1)
- Hearing aid dealers (1)
- Physical therapy (1)
- Horology (1)
- Professional engineers (1)

Two others, Optometry and Cosmetology, are still before the legislature and may be approved for public members this year.

Of course, the public members must not be members of the occupation licensed by the board, but hopefully they will be laypersons with previous interest, knowledge, and experience as consumers in the field. So far as I know, there are no age, residency, education, or other limitations. The appointments are for a period of 1 to 6 years, so anyone offering to serve should be seriously interested.

If you want to offer yourself or nominate someone else (with his/her permission, obviously) you should write to Governor William G. Milliken, The Capitol, Lansing, Michigan 48902. I suggest you send a carbon of the letter to his consumer aide, William R. Ruesta, Office of the Governor, same address. It might be a good idea if you also send copies to Andy Driscoll as President of CAM and to me, or perhaps to all members of the CAM board, so we can know about—and if appropriate support—your nomination.

---

I can put my legs up on the desk. The last time I wore a dress was to an interview. I hadn't done enough of the right things in law school to get away with wearing pants.

Q. How do you feel when you are called on in class?

A. Nervous. For me to talk in class I have to really be prepared. I'd suppose that I'd rather be less shy. People who are shy tend to get stepped on. You should know, you never get called on or raise your hand!

Q. How was your life living in the Law Quad?

A. It is very tight. Cliqueish. I didn't partake of it often. Law students who live in the quad tend to mix with just each other. I treasure my friends outside the law school.

Q. Do you feel closer to other women in the school or to shy people?

A. Shy people. I don't relate to women law students. I don't think about people as men or women anymore. Eventually they'll be more women here. I've never noticed any discrimination here. They'd have to hit me on the head for me to notice it.

Q. Would you want to date a law student?

A. I don't know. I haven't met one. They are all married. The majority you can get to know a lot about in ten minutes: especially the ones into the corporate nonsense.

Q. Best and Worse professors?

A. Allen, Kahn and White are the best. No one thing binds them in common. The worst are those out of touch with the real world. Too abstract. They're the ones who don't seem to care about students like me. As a result I have a hard time getting interested in them.

Q. Would you do it all over again now that you've been thru Law School?

A. No. If I could go back and start again, probably not. I think if I knew how much I would dislike law school I would have chosen
some other thing to do. I really believe I'm qualified for something.
Q. Being interviewed makes you nervous?
A. Yes. I'm afraid of blowing my cover. I need my cover.
Q. I like being anonymous here. How about you?
A. Yes, me too. You really have to be anonymous here to express unhappiness with the institution. Everyone knows everyone else.
P.S. A tip for those of you who put their faith in law school and look for their soul in the law from Bobby Dylan: "She was thinking about the government, thinking about the law, but most of all she was thinking about the jack of hearts." (from Blood on the Tracks)

LAW SCHOOL ENROLLMENT RECORD
The following is a summary of figures released by the ABA on law school enrollment in the 157 ABA approved law schools for fall, 1974.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1973</th>
<th>1974</th>
<th>% increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106,102</td>
<td>110,713</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1964 enrollment - 54,265]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21,788</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1964 - 2,183]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>7,601</td>
<td>8,333</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicanos</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>89,342</td>
<td>88,924</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ABA provisionally approved five new law schools last year. Two new schools received their first classes this year and three more for next year.
[Ed: P.S. James P. White of Indianapolis Law School who assembled this data has declared that "there is no discrimination against women in admission to approved Law Schools." I am sure we are all convinced.]
'evil'. The question is not whether there is a general right to make a judgment, for any decent person would exercise his or her right to object to the killing of the new being at some point in its development. Ask instead, what is the right judgment with regards to the killing of the unborn. The answer to that question is rooted in the abortion controversy: Is the life terminated in an abortion that of a human being?

This issue is fundamental because if the 'fetus' is indeed a human being, the rights and respect which necessarily accrue to such status, weighs heavily against the concerns supporting the woman's alleged "right to abort", and in fact, makes such a right non-existant in all but the most extreme situations.

That speech directed toward this central issue of when human life begins is not futile is evidenced in my own life by the fact that I have been moved by arguments focusing on this issue myself, and have moved a few others with these same ideas. On a larger scale, it seems obvious that very much involved in the change in attitude which eventually resulted in the resounding defeat of the proposed "liberalized" abortion statute a little over two years ago was the growing feeling among the voting public that the five-month line found in the proposal was unacceptable. (The Supreme Court was not impressed, since it's decision does not give the unborn a right to protection at any time before birth; and eight and a half month old fetus is fair game in the eyes of the Supreme Court.)

One might well ask why I spend so much effort in arguing the reasonableness of speaking out on this issue. No doubt, I wish to convince myself, and you that even in the wake of Vietnam and Watergate, words appealing to the conscience can still have some effect, that all is not power and pragmatism. I need to reassure myself that language still has continued vitality despite horrible misuse, and that public speech, therefore, still makes some kind of sense.

In the abortion debate, with a life and death decision in the balance, words should be chosen and used with the care of a poet. Yet, the Madison Avenue advertising man seems to be more prevalent a model for much speech in this controversy, given all the sloganeering and deceptiveness one is confronted with on both sides. Too many defenders of abortion seem content to root their position in abstract labels, like "liberal," "reform," and "liberation," (there are parallel labels on the other side of the controversy) without looking clearly at reality beneath these abstractions. Camus expressed it in The Plague as he spoke out against those who justify murder, in this case, execution, in the name of abstractions.

"...All I maintain is that on this earth there are pestilences and there are victims, and it's up to us, so far as possible not to join forces with the pestilences. That may sound simple to the point of childishness; I can't judge if it's simple, but I know it's true. You see, I'd heard such quantities of arguments, which very nearly turned my head, and turned other people's heads enough to make them approve of murder; and I'd come to realize that all our troubles spring from our failure to use plain, clean-cut language.

"Don't let them tell us any stories. Don't say about the man condemned to death: "He is going to pay his debt to society," but rather, "They're going to chop his head off." (from the essay Between Yes and Know)

I propose then that any consideration of a "right to abort" necessarily involve a realization that what is meant by that abstract phrase is the mangling of the body of an unborn being. Closing one's eyes before pictures of maimed aborted fetus seems no more legitimate to me than blindness of bombing the citizens or the verdant forest of Vietnam from 50,000 feet. Using language as a screen to shield oneself from the very real consequences of one's actions is no more acceptable when the protecting label is fetus rather than "gook", "Jap", or "kike". Look to the consequences of your decision, as I shall try to look clearly at the implications of my stance, and perhaps in our common horror we can talk honestly and civilly about how best to fight the plague of human suffering.

One final personal comment relating to the reasonableness of speech on abortion. I speak partially out of self-defense. Proponents of legalized abortion have defended the Supreme Court's decision on abortion by
noting that it does not force those people opposed to abortion to do anything against their conscience; women may carry and bear their children, if they so choose, abortion being noncompulsory, at least for the time being. But there are many forms of oppression, and though the species which is implied in the Court's decision is subtle, it is torturous nonetheless.

When a person makes a moral commitment, that commitment becomes part of his or her identity. Words or acts relating to this commitment become self-revealing. Specifically, I have concluded that I am a man who believes abortion to be a form of murder when the physical life of the mother is not seriously endangered. I see myself in this light, as do those who know me. Making such a commitment is like holding water in one's own hands. If I open my fingers now, if I acquiesce in the Court's decision not because it is convincing, but because it seems so hopeless to protest, then I have lost part of myself that hopes to maintain some degree of integrity. I become diminished before myself and before others, and take one step closer to the state implied in the description of Malabar Caves: moral bankruptcy.

So I choose to state the roots of my convictions, speaking in my own defense, and in defense of the unborn, shamelessly begging you to listen, and promising to listen in return. I speak not only as an advocate committed to a position, but also as a student of the abortion controversy who is hopefully still receptive and willing to be tested.

The abortion controversy is broad in scope, encompassing moral, social, and legal issues. I choose to pass over the discussion of the validity of the Supreme Court's abortion decision, partially because the issue is very much settled for the time being. There is one viable legal recourse left: a Constitutional amendment. Until such an amendment is passed, the country will live under a Constitution which has been interpreted to provide no protection for the foetus until the moment of birth. The court allows a state to make abortion illegal in the third trimester (unless the physical life of the mother is endangered), but does not require them to do so. Thus, if a state so chooses, it may refrain from enacting an abortion statute, and the killing of an eight and a half month child still in the womb would be perfectly legal.

Thus, for the present, a woman has the power under law, to choose to kill the foetus. The focus is now on the question of whether this power should be used. For many, the question is easily answered; if a woman feels that to have an abortion is in her self-interest, nothing more need be said. Others I have spoken to react sympathetically to the suffering of friends who became unexpectedly pregnant, and conclude that abortion must be justified, for it provided a means of alleviating the anguish of their friends.

Both of these responses weigh heavily in the balance, but are clearly fragments of a much larger puzzle.

Camus states, "There can be no true goodness not true love without the utmost clear-sightedness." These words seem applicable here, for surely one's decision on abortion, as on other matters, should neither be based purely on self-interest, nor on pure emotion, but on a reasoned consideration of the full spectrum of factors involved.

For me, a preliminary question has been ignored when the decision to abort is made with an easy reference to the "right of the woman to control her own body." This slogan merely states a conclusion without providing a justification for the conclusion. Are we dealing with only the woman's body? Or is the foetus a human being, with all rights of a human being? If the unborn being is human, are there factors involved which would justify ending his or her life?

If it is concluded that the foetus is a human being, then it would seem that no other factor other than the risk of death of the mother would justify the killing, since none of the other justifications put forth in favor of abortion such as possible emotional harm to the mother, economic burden, the possibility that the child will be unloved or unhappy in life, possible future overpopulation, or the fact that such killing is widely practiced by others, justify the killing of a human being after birth. If one has the audacity to conclude that the foetus is a human being, and yet has no right to live in the face of these factors,
then every human being's right to live is threatened. Some would say that such fears are far-fetched, but to me, man's capacity to do evil is infinite. I have etched in my mind forever the images I have seen of bulldozers pushing human carcasses into mass graves in Nazi concentration camps, and such memories convince me that those who make light of the attempt to find rational lines of definition in the abortion controversy which will serve as a buffer against attempts to tamper with human life in the future are the fools, not I. Am I wrong?

In determining whether there is a right to kill the foetus, the burden of proof must be on those who claim such a right, for surely it would seem fundamentally fair that there be a presumption in favor of the prospective victim, particularly where this victim cannot speak in its own behalf.

Since the right to kill the foetus is contingent upon the foetus being non-human and a heart pumping blood he has made himself. By forty-five days, the skeleton is complete in cartilage and he makes his first movements of limbs and body. Under the Supreme Court decision, statutes can not ban abortion until six or seven months.

One proposed ground for labeling this biological being non-human is that it is within th woman's body, or connected to it. Yet, of what relevance to the nature of the foetus is the place where it is found? A moment before birth the foetus is virtually identical to the "baby" born into the world. On what rational basis can one say that the same being is non-human inside the woman and human outside? Or that the being becomes magically human at the cutting to the umbilical cord, because it is finally disconnected to the woman's body?

Is the foetus non-human because it is dependent, because it cannot live on its own? A brutal definition, it would seem, that would label a being in need, particularly radical need, as non-human. Furthermore, why is the "foetus" that is dependent on the environment of the mother's body less human than the "baby" dependent upon the technology of medical science. The being is the same; only the source of the satisfaction of its needs has changed.

A variation on the same theme states that human life begins at viability, i.e. when the foetus can live outside the woman's womb with the help of medical technology. Yet the point of viability depends on technological development of the particular culture which the foetus happens to be conceived in at a particular point in time. Medical science has developed today to the point where babies have been born at about twenty weeks and survived. Does this somehow mean that a 20 week old foetus of a decade ago? And that a 12 week old foetus will miraculously become human at some future date as medical science continues to develop?

Further more, I see no logic in the position which holds that a being which is torn from an environment which he was able to live in, and placed in one where he is not able to survive, is somehow therefore non-human. The same might be done to an adult

Before considering whether pro-abortionists meet their burden, consider the biological data relating to the foetus. According to Dr. A.W. Lilly, research professor in fetal physiology, by twenty-five days the developing heart of the foetus starts beating, by fifty days, the foetus has a brain, eyes, ears, mouth, kidneys, liver, umbilical cord,
human being by, say, placing him at the north pole without the equipment he needed to survive. Does his subsequent death make him non-human?

For me, any line defining when human life begins after conception is irrational because it is obviously based on a fiction. Can anyone seriously maintain that at some point after conception, the foetus is actually magically transformed from a non-human to a human? At the point of conception, there actually is such a radical transformation as an entity with an entirely new genetic make-up is formed and will begin to develop its own unique characteristics from that point on. The line drawn after conception is clearly based much more on a consideration of the dangerousness of the abortion procedure to the mother at later stages of the development of the unborn child, and on the desire for a convenient marking point, than on any real sense of when human life begins. An example of how the line which marks when the right to life begins moves with the sense of what is safe for the mother and convenient for those drawing the line is provided in England. It has been my assumption that once a foetus was "born", even though prematurely, there was an obligation on the part of doctors to attempt to maintain the life of the premature child. Now I must question that assumption, and live with that fact that in England and Scandinavia, medical practice allows a doctor to experiment on a live "fetus-child" 18 hours after birth. After the experimentation, the child is killed. Here at home, Dr. James Watson of Harvard, Nobel laureate, was quoted last spring as stating that perhaps babies should not be declared alive until three days after birth so that parents would have the choice of allowing the child to die. The idea seems less shocking once one realizes that it is not unheard of in the U.S. for the foetus to be born alive in the abortion procedure, and simply left to die.

I recall a little over two years ago recalling at a radio broadcast telling of a man who had burst into a hospital nursery and beaten the newborn infants with his fists. Today, I am asked to deaden myself to experimentation on new born beings and to their murder because the mother consents to these things, because the deeds are done privately, neatly by medical scientists, and because the victim is a few months younger.

My private fear is I shall become so deadened. As you undoubtedly have sensed in the beginnings of this essay, I have a strong sense of the possible futility of defending the rights of these new human beings. Yet, I sense that time is running out, and the slender chance of turning the tide will soon become none at all. Despite the claims of those supporting "liberalized" abortion laws that all that is at stake is the right of the individual to make her own decision on this issue, in a broader context, what we are dealing with here is a historic turning point in our culture.

I can speak to you now of the rights of the unborn with some hope that you will still have some sense that the life of the foetus deserves the same reverence and respect as the rest of humanity. But if abortion becomes an accepted part of our culture, as the years go by words appealing to the sacredness of the life of the foetus will sound as incomprehensible and strange as the words of a long-deceased Indian describing the depth of his reverence for nature: "You ask me to cut the grass and make hay, and sell it and to be rich like the white-man. But how dare I cut my mother's hair? Shall I take a knife, the plow, and cut my mother's breast?" We have lived so long with the brutalization of nature, we can really have very little access to the feelings of that Shishone. And thus it may well be in the future for those who have spoken words resisting the killing of the unborn child. So I state my case now motivated in part by the faint hope that you may be moved, and the even dimmer hope that a Constitutional Amendment can serve as an obstacle to our culture's continued movement towards the denigration of the value of human life.

I recognize that accepting the unborn's right to live is a very difficult step, for it necessarily implies a high cost for the mother, perhaps for the child, and possibly, for society. I further recognize that there is an obligation, if one is committed to the rights of the unborn, to live in some fashion help alleviate the suffering and problems which accompany that position. And thankfully, there are some potential
remedies for some of these problems. Research into improved methods of birth control and educational programs which would increase the understanding and usage of birth control devices is a major step toward diminishing the number of unwanted pregnancies. Expansion of day-care facilities and adoption agencies would help lighten the burden of child-rearing. (I might mention here that for white women at least, the rationale justifying abortion because the child would be unwanted and unloved is an empty one. Adoption agencies have waiting lists literally years long for young white children. There are some reports of mothers trying to sell their babies, in fact, the demand is so great. It is true that such is not the case for non-caucasian children, but one would hope that this situation will change for the better in the coming years). The prospect of overpopulation seems less frightening, in the United States at least given recent reports about the slow-down in our population growth, but even granting this as a potential problem, certainly birth control is a more desirable way of confronting that problem.

But there is no magic wand to wipe away the human suffering involved in the abortion dilemma. The remedies posed above are insufficient, I know. And there are some problems which seem to have even weaker solutions. I cannot answer the charge that making abortion on demand illegal would redirect many pregnant women to illegal abortionists. This is no doubt a real prospect, as is the danger that women will be injured or even killed because of the negligence of these underground abortionists. I protest against these deaths and injuries also, but choose to look to birth control as a possible remedy rather than legalized abortion on demand. My reasons should be clear enough by this point, but an additional factor not taken into account by many is that legalized abortion does not imply an end to illegal abortions.

The inequity of a situation where more well-off pregnant women can pay for an illegal abortion, while very poor women cannot is real enough, but impressive only if one accepts the right to kill the foetus in the first place. One need not be very upset about the inability of the very poor to come up with the funds to kill a human being. This does not imply, as some seem to think, indifference to other problems related to poverty.

The anguish which is involved in the confrontation of a young pregnant girl with her parents and sometimes with her peers is a problem with no immediate solution, though one might expect that time is ultimately a kind of remedy to this suffering. But in any case, the killing of an unborn human being seems very much an illegitimate escape from such situations.

In summary, through my eyes it seems that hundreds of thousands of human beings are being inexcusably killed each year, that these murders are being justified through the misuse of language, that the definitions of human life used by pro-abortionists provide no rational line which might help limit unwarranted manipulation and oppression of human life now or in the future, and that such oppression is not at all an unlikely prospect given the bloody history of the twentieth century, the movements now detectable toward behavioral engineering, genetic manipulation, etc., and the fact that man's powers to intrude upon human life and dignity are greater now than ever before, and will continue to grow.

Most importantly perhaps, through my eyes it seems that, despite the fact that the vocal supporters of 'liberalized' abortion have often seen themselves as reformers, radicals, or counter-culturalists, the movement to accept the killing of the unborn is consistent with, and I think an outgrowth of the most brutal aspects of our culture. Thomas Merton once referred to modern Western man, and particularly America, as the one-eyed giant. He felt that our culture suffers from an incomplete vision of the world. We see the world as clay to be molded, to be infused with our life, to be transformed into our (American) dreams. Things or people are valuable in that they are useful or productive in this transforming process. The stream may be valued primarily because it may be transformed into electricity, the forest, because it may be transformed into homes, a human being, because he or she can be transformed into labor. One need not conclude that his way of seeing things is illegitimate in and of itself, for it seems an important part of human nature to be a creator. The mistake lies in seeing humanity as the creator of all value. The
one-eyed giant is blind in that he cannot see his role as creature in a world blessed with value and meaning independent of man's powers to create things of value. The tree may be valued simply for its 'tree-ness'. And a human, simply for his or her humanity. Even a very small human.

Because modern culture seems generally deadened to such things, the drive to transform knows no restraints but those of practicality. The natural world is used and consumed with abandon until it is no longer useful to do so. Within man's world, those unfortunate who cannot be productive in our crusade to create values are made outcasts: the aged, the uneducated, the seriously retarded, and now, the foetus. The power of organization is a theoretical remedy for such outcasts, for our culture understands power. It is useful to do so. But they are generally incapable of organizing themselves, and have too few advocates to look for help. So they remain powerless and oppressed, and among the most vulnerable and oppressed of the lot is the foetus. Until the one-eyed giant sees things whole once again and learns to be receptive to the inherent value within the world, the foetus will continue to be the victim of self-interest and the effort of the new breed of American dreamers to transform our world, under the banner of "quality of life" or the like, into something of value, at the cost of dismissing and oppressing those creatures who do not constitute "meaningful life" (from the Supreme Court decision) in their clouded eyes.
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Basketball Poll

Ranger Howie's record lasted only one week. John Mezzanotte showed everyone what he learned at Old Nassau by fashioning a 13-2 mark for a .867 percentage. The overall percentage increased for the fourth week in a row to .559.

Mississippi (18\% at Alabama
Brigham Young (20\% at Arizona
Utah (8\% at Arizona
Florida (8\% at Auburn
Duke (10\% at Clemson
Detroit (12\% at Marquette
Fordham (8\% at Rutgers
Pennsylvania at Harvard (10\%)
Illinois (10\% at Purdue
Northwestern (40\% at Indiana
Kansas at Oklahoma (12\%)
Kentucky (4\% at Tennessee
LaSalle (4\% at Notre Dame
Maryland (4\% at North Carolina
Minnesota (4\% at Michigan
Iowa (6\% at Michigan
NC State at Wake Forest (10\%)
Wisconsin (4\% at Ohio State
Oregon St. (8\% at UCLA
Oregon (4\% at Southern Cal

Tiebreaker:
How many points will be scored by both teams in the Pennsylvania-Harvard Game?

Name ____________________________

George A. Pagano

RG Rankings

1 Indiana (7) 11 Marquette
2 UCLA 12 LaSalle
3 Maryland 13 Oregon
4 Kentucky 14 Pennsylvania
5 Alabama 15 Creighton
6 Louisville 16 Arizona
7 NC State 17 Holy Cross
8 Arizona St. 17 Memphis State
9 Southern Cal 19 Rutgers
10 North Carolina 20 Clemson
10 North Carolina 20 Pan American

Foul Shooting
Anyone interested in participating in IM foul shooting should contact George Pagano at the RG office.

Ripapart: As a special birthday present you are not automatically disqualified this week.

Fugawi: If you take an extra copy to write down your answers, we'll break your head.
Love,
Tony P.

Brandes, Louis:
Glen. I can call spirits from the vasty deep.
Hots. Why, so can I, or so can any man;
But will they come when you do call for them?  

I Henry IV (III i 53)

Hoover, John Edgar:
...the villain shall not 'scape;
The Duke must grant me that. Besides, his picture
I will send far and near, that all the kingdom
May have due note of him;

King Lear (II i 83)

There is no truth to the rumor that Hamlet would give his right arm to be ambidextrous.

Public Policy, Unenforceable As Against:
If you repay me not on such a day,
Such a place, such sum or sums as are
Express'd in the condition, let the forfeit
Be nominated for an equal pound
Of your fair flesh, to be cut off and taken
In what part of your body pleaseth me.

Merchant of Venice (I III 146)

Reis, Robert:
O, what a happy title do I find

Sonnet XC (ii)

Agnew, Spiro T.:
In law, what plea so tainted and corrupt
But, being seasoned with a gracious voice,
Obscures the show of evil?

Merchant of Venice (III ii 74)

President, The Powers of The:
May one be pardon'd and retain the offense?
In the corrupted currents of this world
Offense's gilded hand may shave by justice,
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law...

Hamlet (III iii 56)

Holmes, Oliver Wendell, Jr.:
So to the laws at large I write my name.

Love's Labour's Lost (I I 156)

Internal Revenue Service:
I tax you not, you elements.

King Lear (III ii 16)

Kennedy, Joan:
Holding the eternal spirit, against her will,
In the vile prison of afflicted breath.

King John (III iv 18)