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KNOCK! KNOCK!

WHO'S THERE?

WATSON.

WATSON WHO?

WATSON NICE SHRINK LIKE YOU DOING IN A SCHOOL LIKE THIS?
SECOND ALUMNAE-STUDENT CONFERENCE

Friday, Feb. 25

WELCOME!! COCKTAIL PARTY!!

7:30-10:30 P.M. WLSA President Nancy Keppleman,
Lawyer's Club Lounge
Dean Susan Eklund

Saturday, Feb. 26

Hutchins Hall

8:30-9:30 A.M. Registration, Coffee and Donuts Provided

9:30-12:30 P.M. "Legal Information" Room 150
Moderator: Barbara Etheridge

9:30-10:00 A.M. Women In Prisons, the DeHoco Project
Donna Cole, Third Year Student

10:00-10:45 A.M. Family Law Issues
Prof. David Chambers

10:45-11:30 A.M. "General Electric"
Ms. Virginia Nordby

11:30-12:30 P.M. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act
Delores Smith, Federal Reserve Board, Consumer Division

12:30-2:00 P.M. Soup and Sandwich Bar at the Ann Arbor Inn
($3.50)
Presentation by WLSA and FLS

2:00-5:00 P.M. CAREER PANELS

2:00-2:00 P.M. Women in Administrative Agencies, Room 236
Student Moderator: Carol Grant
Panelists: Susan Atkinson
Kathy Gerstenberger
Shirley Moscow
City Government Careers, Room 242
Student Moderator: Jane McAtee
Yvonne Hughes, '73
Adele Laporte, '75
Mary Potter Sharp, '39

3:00-4:00 P.M. Women In The Judiciary
Room 212
Student Moderator: Barbara Rogalle Miller
Panelists: Circuit Judge Zoe S. Burkholz, '47
Admin. Law Judge Karen H. Jacobs, '67
District Judge Margaret Schaeffer, '45

Legal Aid and Legal Services
Room 242
Student Moderator: Barbara Etheridge
Panelists: Joanne Betlem
Nancy Lipper, '76
Betty Schwartz, '73
Pam Hyde

Women In Law Firms, Room 236
Student Moderator: Marilyn Putney
Panelists: Bettye Elkins, '70
Patricia White, '74

4:00-5:00 P.M. Women in Corporate Law,
Room 212
Student Moderator: Susan Bittner
Panelists: Joyce Bihary '75
Mary Eberle, '75
Diane Kaye, '75
Carol Rogoff, '76

Women Teaching Law, Room 236
Student Moderator: Lea Vaughn
Panelists: Rhonda Rivera
Christina Whitman, '74
Janet Keuneke, '76

7:00 P.M. Cash bar at Campus Inn
followed by

Banquet ($9.00) (Dessert option $1.20)
Keynote Speech: Wanda Reif;
Practicing in Washington:
Lessons I Didn't Learn
At Law School
Sunday, Feb. 27  Brunch - Lawyer's Club; $2.85
11:00 A.M.  Discussion session sponsored by Ann Arbor firm of Burgoyne and Pratt, Alumnae.
Shirley Burgoyne, '55
Diana Pratt, '76

ATTENTION LAW STUDENTS!

Where can you find free liquor and other refreshments in a pleasant surrounding that provides you with the opportunity to mingle with approximately sixty graduates of this law school? If you answered "At the Women Law Students Association's Alumnae Conference", you'd be right! Please join alumnae, faculty and fellow students at the Lawyer's Club Lounge this Friday night at 7:30 P.M.

The Cocktail Party is only the beginning of what will be a truly successful weekend, as sixty former women law school students have already registered to participate. Aside from the legal presentations Saturday morning and the career panels that same afternoon, there are numerous happenings that have basically a social purpose. We want to encourage all students, regardless sex, etc., to attend the luncheon and banquet and keynote address. The Conference Committee and the Michigan Union have made every effort to allow maximum student participation while accommodating student budgets. To join in the luncheon you may sign up for a seat on the Brown Bag signup sheet in front of Room 100 from 11 A.M. to 1 P.M. One dollar and twenty cents ($1.20) entitles you to coffee, blueberry cheesecake and a comfortable chair to enjoy the keynote address by 1971 graduate Wanda J. Reif. The title of her speech is "Practicing In Washington: Lessons I Didn't Learn At Law School." She will have a question and answer session after her address and has promised to come armed with names and addresses of potential employers.

What will you get out of this conference? Isn't it just another women's thing" Of course the Conference Committee is biased because we have put much time and effort and money into the organization of this "women's thing." However, these women graduates have had years of experience in the judiciary, administrative law, legal teaching, Washington law practices and local government. These women are also coming with the hopes of being able to communicate with us about job possibilities. We can't think of a law student who could not benefit from some portion of the program.

BUY TICKETS FOR MEALS THIS WEEK! NO SALES AT CONFERENCE ITSELF!

Friday

SENIOR JUDGESHIP APPLICATIONS ARE NOW AVAILABLE IN ROOM 318 HUTCHINS DUE MARCH 4

International Law Society

There will be a meeting of the ILS this Friday, Feb. 25 at the Law Club Lounge, 12:15-1 PM.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss:
(2) ILS Budget & other plans.
(3) Organization of election of ILS officers for next year.
(4) Take yearbook picture of those who have contributed to ILS programs this year.

All ILS members are invited. Bring your bag lunch.
**Monday**

NEW YORK BAR REVIEW  BAR/BRI

The first meeting of the CPLR Course will be Monday night, Feb. 28th. See posted signs for time and location. Bar materials are in. In order to pick-up materials $100.00 of course fee must be paid. (that is, if you made a $50.00 deposit, you must pay $50.00 more to get materials).

Representative: Phil Fileri 764-2014

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN & THE LAW

Madison, Wisc. March 24-27

Here's a chance to learn lots that UM Law School doesn't teach, plus an exciting opportunity to meet women lawyers and law students from all over the country. We need to get together to organize car-pools and shared hotel space to keep costs down, and also we've already missed the initial registration deadline, so this is urgent!

Organizational Meeting
Monday, Feb. 28 Noon Women's Lounge

Anyone who absolutely can't make it, leave message on board in WLSA office as to time you want to leave and preference as to hotel space.

For more info see the Women's bulletin boards.

**Tuesday**

BOOKS AND MONEY GIVEAWAY

PAD will once again be returning money and/or unsold books from past January's used book sale. If you have books/money left with PAD, or think that you might have books/money left with PAD, PLEASE come to Rm. 118 between 10 a.m. and 1 p.m. on Tuesday, March 1. It may be your last chance.

Gary Visscher 662-3583

**Wednesday**

SEMINARS AND CLINICAL LAW COURSES

Materials and sign-up sheets for seminars for Fall 1977 and for Clinical Law Courses for Summer 1977 and Fall 1977 will be available in Room 300 at 2 PM on Wednesday, March 2.

INTERESTED IN THE BARBOUR WATERMAN GYMNASIUM CONTROVERSY??

The Committee for Re-Use of Barbour Waterman needs a short memorandum for use at the Regent's Meeting the third week in March. The issues are relatively narrow concerning the University's duty to file an environmental impact statement. For more information drop by the ELS office or contact Eric Lipson (763-2176, 662-9504) or Jerry Lax (994-3000).

LSSS ELECTION

The Law School Student Senate election will be held March 30, 1977. The following positions will be filled.

Candidates must qualify by filing a petition bearing the signatures of forty (40) currently enrolled law students. Petition forms will be available at the Lawyers Club desk beginning March 1. The filing deadline is March 16 at 5:00 p.m.

Jesse Jones (668-7802)
Deborah Friedman (663-6817)
Ms. Maxine Virtue (a practicing attorney in Ann Arbor and Chairperson of the State Bar of Michigan Family Law Section) urgently seeks "a few good persons" to aid her in cataloging recent family law cases for the spring edition of the Family Law Section Newsletter. Ms. Virtue characterized the volunteer work as "a bit tedious, at times, but very rewarding."

If you're interested in giving an hour or two, please call Ms. Virtue at 761-7682 or Grace Holmes of ICLE at 764-0533.

A paltry $3.00 (annual dues) brings you bountiful benefits which include (but are not limited to):

1) a year's subscription to the State Bar of Michigan JOURNAL (a $12.00 value);

2) inexpensive insurance plans;

3) free membership (non-voting) in state bar sections [providing outstanding opportunities to meet practicing attorneys in areas of your interest]; and

4) a flashy entry on your résumé.

If you apply for membership now you will be qualified to vote (and run, if you wish) in the March election of Councilors [3 from UM] to sit on the 1977-78 governing board of the Law Student Section. If interested, call Rich Ingalls at 434-5896.

"Students in the Law School, friends, staff, faculty, and her family contributed to a fund to establish an annual award in memory of Jane L. Mixer who met an untimely death while in her first year in the Law School. The award will go to the law student who has made the greatest contribution to activities designed to advance the cause of social justice in the preceding year."

Provisions for this award further provide that "nominations for the award will be made by students in the Law School with the recipient to be chosen from among those nominated by a committee of the faculty."

Nominations are now in order. Please submit them to Lillian Ushiro in Room 906 Legal Research Building. Closing date for nominations will be 12:00 noon, March 15, 1977.

The faculty committee would appreciate a brief statement of the activities of the various nominees thought to qualify them for the award. The recipient will be announced at the Honors Convocation on April 22, 1977.
OFFICIAL NEWS RELEASE
(and/or humble request for free publicity)

Thursday, March 31 through Sunday, April 3, UAC-MUSKET will present "The Music Man" in Power Center. Tickets are available now from UAC Ticket Central.

WLSA BAKE SALES

Many thanks to everyone who contributed their time, culinary talents, and appetites to our bake sales. We hope that now we'll see you at the Alumnae Conference activities this weekend, which the bake sale proceeds have helped to bring to the law school community.

JUAN LUIS TIENDA SCHOLARSHIP FUND

The Mexican dinner held on Sunday the 20th at the Law Club dining room was a tremendous success. Many law students and faculty attended, as did persons from outside the law school community. As a result La Raza Law Students has now raised the $2000 minimum necessary to establish a scholarship in Juan's name.

Since the dinner was the product of the goodwill and generosity of many we would like to thank some of those persons. Dean St. Antoine we thank for making the Law Quad kitchen available to us. Dolores Hobbs, Gary Spitzer and Sherry Clifton assisted us in cooking for 500 persons. The Produce Co-op on 4th Avenue provided free UFW lettuce. Lino Mendiola, Chicano Advocate for the University, supported us throughout the endeavor in many ways. Keith Hefner and Stafford Matthews donated their talent and time for publicity.

One of the most significant aspects of this scholarship is that it was made possible through the contributions of many people. It represents the efforts of many to acknowledge Juan's contributions to the law school and to us. Most of you who donated in different ways remain unnamed -- but to each one of you go my most sincere and heartfelt thanks.

The $2000 raised constitutes the principal of the scholarship. This will yield $100 interest yearly, which will be the amount awarded to the recipient of the scholarship. The scholarship will be administered by the Financial Aids Office. Further details are still to be worked out, and will be reported in the RG.

Though the minimum need to establish the scholarship has been met, we hope contributions will continue to be made in future months and years. Many law students and other persons have expressed a desire to contribute after graduation when they have incomes. In this way we hope the scholarship will become more substantial. Meanwhile our initial goal has been met. We thank all who helped to make it possible.

Gracias!

Elsa Lamelas
La Raza

READING AND WRITING LAWS

ANN ARBOR---For the purpose of writing laws clearly and accurately, the English language ---or any other existing "natural" language, for that matter---has distinct limitations, according to Michigan law professor, Layman Allen.

Prof. Allen would like to see, for example, the word "iff"---meaning "if and only if" ---added to the English language in order to make our laws "serve their authors' purposes more fully and become less susceptible to differing legal interpretations." He also believes that, in writing of most of our laws, regular prose should be supplemented by an outline form that clearly indicates the relationships between
conditions and results. His reasoning is that clarity of structure is difficult to achieve with ordinary prose and punctuation alone.

Prof. Allen, who teaches the seminars in symbolic logic and legal drafting, has been waging a campaign against "inadvertently ambiguous" statutes and other legal documents since 1958. He claims the problem of "disorderly syntax" in legal writing is a "contemporary disgrace." Syntax refers to the way the relationships of words and phrases of a sentence affect the meaning of the sentence.

Prof. Allen was recently awarded a grant from the National Science Foundation to investigate the prevalence of "syntatic ambiguity" in our laws and to explore methods of dealing with the problem. With the aid of research assistants (of course), he plans to comb through statutes and, where appropriate, "normalize" them (put them into simpler outline form with more logical syntax). He will then conduct experiments to see if judges, practicing attorneys and others can work faster and more accurately with the rewritten statutes than with the originals.

Prof. Allen also hopes to develop what he calls the "query method" of teaching legal drafting. Under this system, students learn to logically relate ideas by asking appropriate questions about a given statute, and then use this information to reconstruct the statute in "normalized" form.

Prof. Allen is quick to point out that, although many of our laws are unnecessarily open to different interpretations, many are meant to be that way. "Legislators," he says, "often intentionally use vague or general words in our laws, either to achieve political compromises, or to incorporate flexibility in the statutes, allowing them to remain appropriate through time."

Allen has no argument with laws that have been made intentionally vague. The due process clauses in the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the U.S. Constitution are good examples of general terms which have stood the test of time. His arguments is with documents whose language is uncertain as a result of the carelessness--or lack of awareness--of the draftsmen.

Prof. Allen feels that most law schools, to the extent that they teach their students legal drafting, tend to focus on semantics (or the significance of the meanings of words) rather than the syntax or logic of drafting. As a result, the legal profession, to a considerable extent, has a blind spot in this area.

This failing is evident in such laws as the Internal Revenue Code, one of our most complex and carefully-drafted legal documents. Although portions of the code are itemized in the outline form that Prof. Allen endorses, this is not done systematically or comprehensively.

"I used to bet a steak dinner with anyone," he says, "that I could find a syntatic ambiguity on any randomly-chosen page of the code. And I have never lost that bet."

Poorly drafted students and other legal documents create confusion for judges, lawyers and clients and can increase or prolong litigation. In the long run, inadvertently uncertain statutes can inappropriately tilt the balance of power away from the legislature and toward the judiciary, since judges are called upon to interpret uncertain statutes written by legislators.

One reason for ambiguity in the syntax of statutes, says Prof. Allen, is that legal draftsmen "rely on punctuation to serve the function that parenthesis do in mathematical notion"---setting off one phrase from another, and denoting relationships between phrases.

Also, as in Connecticut and other states, tradition calls for laws to be written in prose, uninterrupted by the "subsectionary" or an outline format.

But Prof. Allen predicts a growing trend toward "normalization," now already practiced to some extent as a means of offsetting the shortcomings of punctuation in clearly expressing complex relationships. The professor would also like to see his "query method" of training law students used at other law schools.
LETTERS

To The R.G. Staff:
When I decided to write in response to the allegations made in last week's issue regarding the reduction in the R.G. budget by the L.S.S.S. I was hard put to decide which of the three commentators to address--the Editor, the Malicious Memo Maker of Clarissa. Immoderately, I have decided to take issue with all three.

Ned, I resent both the tone of your editorial and the factual inaccuracies in it. The R.G. and the Mental Health Law Society were not the only organizations who had their budgets reduced. The Women Law Students' Association also had its budget cut, and I trust that no one would fail to characterize WLSA as a "special interest organization", supposedly one of the groups whose budget the Senate "has avoided the reappraisal of".

Your belief that the R.G. is a "neutral body which impartially serves the entire student body is ludicrous. Every student organization at this law school is a "special interest" group, including the Law Review, the Entertainment Law Society, PAD, WLSA and the R.G. Each has its own constituency with their own common goals and interests. Each offers diverse services and opportunities to the student body in the form of guest speakers, special events, meals, conferences, entertainment, information or merely the education of its individual members. No one would wish to join all of the groups, some decide not to participate in the activities of any. But what these groups offer is there, available to one who wishes to take advantage of it. Their common contribution enriches this school. I agree, Clarissa, that the R.G. serves a valuable function at this school--as a forum for discussion of controversial issues and as an information disseminator. The paper could adequately serve this function with about three pages a week. I am afraid that I must disagree with your further statement that "the talent [to create a first rate journal] is here". I have not seen evidence of it, and that surprises me. A substantial portion of the students here are supposedly polished writers. Lest I be misunderstood, let me state that my problem with the MMM, the Pearl, et al. is not with a lack of command of the English language, but rather with the tasteless swill that is palmed off as wit within these pages.

That brings me to the diatribe run last week under the MMM's byline. I hesitate to dignify your infantile remarks with a serious reply, and will confine myself to one point only. As a student at this law school, and as a former member of the L.S.S.S. I strongly object to your assertion that George Vineyard cut the R.G. budget. There are 14 people on the L.S.S.S. Presumably those individuals possess some degree of intelligence and autonomy. I know some of the present Senate members personally, and I am sure that those persons, at least, are capable of thinking for themselves. The Senate cut the R.G. budget by about 3%! I believe that the budget cut was the result of rational fiscal action, and not the result of any "grudge" held against the R.G. by either George or the Senate as a whole. If, however, the Senate had been motivated by a low regard for the R.G., it would have had to look no further than the dribble in your "column" to justify the curtailment of the spending of my student fee and that of my fellow students on the costs of printing such trash.

GAYLE HORETSKI
GV RESPONDS TO R.G. EDITORIAL

I had anticipated some feedback in the R.G. concerning the Senate's decision to reduce the R.G. budget by $200, but I had hoped your account would be reasonably accurate, if not objective, so that there would be no need for a reply. Unfortunately, though most readers are probably sick of the issue by now, I feel constrained on behalf of myself and other members of the Senate to give a point by point refutation of your editorial. In a nutshell, the reason that I feel compelled to do this is that you based your arguments upon grossly inaccurate assertions of fact relating to the Senate's actions and engaged in some of the most intellectually dishonest obfuscations of the underlying issues that I could imagine.

1) You point out that the initial R.G. budget request was cut by $600 at "the beginning of the semester." Aside from the fact that this cut took place last spring, not last month, it has not the slightest relevance to the issue before the senate which was whether or not to reduce the R.G. budget by $200 now as part of an overall budget revision which was necessary. Last spring virtually everyone who asked for more than they had the year before had their requested budgets cut substantially. In addition, you could have renewed your request in the fall when the final budget was approved, but you did not. I suspect the reason that you did not was that you realized the $600 cut was tied to the Senate's strong disapproval (made explicit by Senate vote) of the policy of paying those who write for the R.G. rather or in addition to those who do the more mundane, non-ego-trip work of layout. More on the issue of salaries below.

2) You baldly assert that the R.G. has a record of fiscal responsibility over the years. Responsibility is a relative term and in the R.G.'s case highly debatable. Then you tie this assertion to a quote taken out of context from my memo of Feb. 1. The full paragraph read: "In addition to getting everything set for the rest of the year, your group can benefit from participating in this budget revision process by getting a head start on planning your budget request for 1977-78. You will doubtless come out ahead with the new Senate if you have your stuff together for making your 77-78 request and can point to a track record of responsible management in 76-77. Coming out "ahead" obviously means ahead of where you might come out if you are not well-prepared for the 77-78 budget process or do not have a record of responsibility. There is no inconsistency at all between my memo and the $200 reduction of this year's R.G. budget. Not only is it unrealistic to expect everything you have asked for just because you have presented you case well and what you do is worthwhile, it is especially surprising that you had such expectations when you did not in fact present your case well. Though you carefully misinterpreted the part of my memo that you quoted, you conveniently ignored the parts of it that requested that any proposed changes from our recommended provisions be presented in writing with justifications and counter-proposals for balancing the budget. Nearly every other group affected by the proposed revisions submitted a written response, and some of them went into detail as to alternative places for the cuts.

3) You allege that the $200 cut sets R.G. back six years. This is just plain false. You omitted to mention that this year's budget is the first since that time that did not earmark money for summer productions of the R.G. (you did not ask for it) and yet the salaries and supplies portion of the budget was increased by $100. The $200 cut is not tied to any particular portion of the budget but I think it clear from the discussion that we assumed you would take the cut in your printing budget. As you are aware, in 1971 and every year up until last year the R.G. printing expenses were paid directly by the Dean from his discretionary funds and the amount apparently "floated" rising along with printing costs and the amount printed. As I understand it, the amount printed was effectively without limitation except for the Dean's expressed reluctance to fund extensive reproduction of materials appearing in bar journals and the Law Quad Notes, publications readily accessible to most students. Far from being reduced to the situation of six years ago, the $200 cut will permit you to operate above the level you did last year when you underspent your printing budget by more than $300 (the information I have indicates that copy center rates have not increased since last year).

4) Your allegation that the Mental Health Law Society was the only other organization whose budget was cut is the most incredible in light of the revisions proposal which was sent to you and your attendance at the Senate Meeting. In fact, the following organizations other than R.G. sustained the following cuts (note that most are larger
5) You charge the Senate with mismanagement and imply that this is the cause of the need to revise the budget. Your criticisms may well have some validity, but you grossly overstate this part of your case. The fact is that we are now looking into a solution to the pop machine problems and may act in any or all of the following ways: 1) discontinue the service; 2) get a new machine (convert to returnables in anticipation of the new Michigan law); 3) raise the price. You assert that we will have a "loss of over $1,300!" but that is really the difference between our anticipated loss and the profits we had hoped to make. The actual loss should be no more than $600 and that is mostly beyond our control at this point. Briefly, our anticipated profit figure was taken from faulty data relating to prior years, the cost of pop has risen dramatically in recent months, we own the machine which is old and has required frequent repairs, we have been reluctant to raise the prices because we wished to provide a low-priced service to students and because a substantial outlay is required to change the mechanism to charge more. As I say, to some extent we blew it by not coming to understand what was happening quickly enough, and we are now moving to correct the situation one way or another. Believe me, it may be "hard to imagine a pop machine losing money" (maybe that is why we got into this difficulty), but once you learn something about it, it is not at all hard to imagine a 25¢ pop machine losing money when the pop costs nearly 20¢ per can wholesale. Finally, you again chose to ignore other factors leading to the need for the budget revision, namely the way the laws of Michigan hobbled us as far as deriving revenue from mixers.

Your reference to the First Amendment and the quote (without cite) from the Supreme Court were interesting but totally inapposite. An editor has no First Amendment rights vis a vis his/her publisher. But even if the R.G. were a regulated medium rather than a governmentally owned one, your position would not hold up since the Senate has never suggested any controls on the content of the R.G. are related to the budget cut. You are free to express virtually any editorial position (even irresponsible ones such as that in the last issue), but to call the budget cut a First Amendment infringement would be tantamount to requiring the LSSS to spend all its funds on the R.G. since to do anything else would threaten the First Amendment (if we do that, then I want to be editor).

Finally, you assert that the cut cannot be easily absorbed by the R.G. and imply that this follows from the fact that your budget is much smaller than that at other law schools. This is a most atrocious non sequitur. First, one of the main reasons that I proposed the rather modest cut in the R.G. budget was that in my opinion the cut could be made there with absolutely no discernible effect on the R.G. whatsoever. To use your terms, I felt (and apparently the Senate agreed) that the budget should be cut where it could be cut without substantial harm to the organizations' programs. R.G. spent about $2,400 all of first semester, even after the dreaded cut you have $3,100 for this semester. Despite the fact that Winter term is longer than Fall term and your assertion that more material is submitted in spring term, it appears that you will have an average of about $175 per issue for 15 issues this term (you only budgeted for 14) as opposed to an average of about $135 per issue in the Fall based upon 14 issues. These figures tend to substantiate further the inferences to be drawn from the fact that R.G. underspent its printing budget by over $300 last year, apparently without refusing to print anything at all that was submitted. In addition, if it will help any, you have my pledge to stop filling up your pages when my term ends March 31.

Comparing the current R.G. budget to the newspaper budgets at other schools is interesting, but it involves apples and oranges and is relevant only to the question of whether the R.G. ought to be changes altogether. At your current level of operation, $200 more or less is not going to make the difference between a slick magazine format and xerox; $200 is not going to give the editor-in-chief a full-ride scholarship.

If you seriously believe that the R.G. should
be funded at the same level as these other schools' papers, why have you never come to the Senate or the Dean with a proposal to that effect. It is not altogether unlikely that the Senate would support a request to the Dean for a much higher level of funding including some adequate staff salaries, but there are a number of questions that would have to be dealt with and the money would almost certainly have to come from either Law School funds or a substantial increase in the student fee or ad and subscription revenue. As it stands now the R.G. costs the Senate about 15¢ per copy of which about a third comes directly from the individual student in the form of a pro rata share of the LSSS portion of the student fee. Do law students want a slick newspaper badly enough to pay more? Would anyone be willing to put in the necessary time and effort to do a really good job even if there were a scholarship attached? How much control would the Law School Administration demand over content and quality if the R.G. were operated on a more grandiose scale? Would merely paying people and using a fancier printing process insure an improvement in quality?

The latter question is one that is of particular concern to me in light of some of your comments and those of others appearing throughout the last issue. My concern as LSSS President is with the short run, i.e. given the level at which you are currently operating and the limited resources available, are you doing the best job that you can? My prior criticisms of the R.G. were and are still unrelated to the isolated $200 reduction but I still stand by them. I personally do not believe you are doing a very good job with what you have now, yet you assert the desirability of a quantum leap in the level of R.G. sophistication with the implication that people will give their all if they are paid a lot. That may be true of some people, but I doubt that you will find many legal aid workers who will admit that they do a less than adequate job for their clients because it is "only pro bono." Virtually all of the committees and organizations associated with LSSS are purely volunteer in nature and working on a lot of them is even more thankless than working on the R.G. for which there is both miniscule pay and the credit box stroking.

My feeling is that once one undertakes to render a service such as putting out the R.G., one ought to do the best job possible under the circumstances. Conversely, one ought not to undertake volunteer commitments using other peoples' money unless one is motivated to render a service that meets some rather strict qualitative standards. Somehow I get the feeling from the somewhat hysterical response by yourself and other members of the staff to this budget cut that your motivation is not altogether of the latter kind but is rather tainted by the faint odors of the porkbarrel or obscured by the sotto voce grumblings of bureaucratic empire-builders. Perhaps my suspicions are triggered by the fact that there was little else in the last issue of the R.G. (excluding submissions by "outside" organizations) other than slanted commentary about your own plight. Perhaps they are triggered by the fact that to my knowledge the only times anyone from the R.G. has come to a meeting or otherwise contacted LSSS for information on any topic whatsoever relating to issues in the law school were those occasions on which the R.G. budget was being considered.

Whenever you are ready to settle down and make the best of your current situation, by which I mean trying to figure out the way to turn out the best and most useful R.G. for $5,500 rather than $5,700 this year, I will be happy to help in any way that I can. If your editorial produces a groundswell of constituent support for reinstatement of the $200 which the truth as set forth above does not dissipate, I am sure the Senate will reconsider the matter and I will stand ready to carry out the Senate's directions.

Sincerely yours,

George Vinyard
LSSS President

THOUGHTS IN A LAW SCHOOL CLASS:

I KNOW WHAT I'LL DO...DURING LUNCH I'LL RUN OFF AND JOIN THE FOREIGN LEGION!
Dear Ned:

I have just read the latest issue of the Res Gestae, including your editorial. I have several comments.

You tell us that RG financing lags behind the budget of the average law school newspaper. What does average mean? Is it all relevant to look at averages when considering a newspaper of the quality of the Res Gestae?

You assert that the RG is not like other law school associations, but a disinterested servant of the public interest. For some time now, the RG has not been a neutral forum, but has engaged in attacks upon the LSSS and its president regarding budgetary matters. The RG, it will be recalled, also entered the fray last year with its unsigned editorial concerning LSSS election slates. In the relevant respects, the RG is no less a "special interest organization" than the unnamed groups slighted in your editorial.

In any event, the question is not one of labeling groups as special interest or not but of their value to the school and its students. My own opinion, for what it's worth, is that a group like WLSA has done much more for all of us this year than the RG. With less confidence, I'd suggest the same about the pop vending machine.

Clarissa notes in her column that Harvard's student newspaper sells for 20 cents an issue. Do you think you could sell the RG for anything? Do you really think that malicious attacks on George Vinyard will rally students around your cause rather than his?

In light of the RG's performance this year and the reasons for its 3½% budget cut, your allusion to the First Amendment is laughable. Come out of fantasyland, Ned.

Sincerely,

Peter Winkler

"UNCLE VANYA"

Lawrence DeVine, powerful Detroit Free Press Drama critic, has the reviewer's penchant for coming up with the "cleves" drama critique. Damning what provided SOME of us with pleasure the night before, DeVine describes the Powers Center's "Uncle Vanya" as "professionally done, very good-looking and not very interesting." He complains: "Uncle Vanya suggests a drowning man to me, who is seeing whole impotent life flash before him - and then has to go on living."

DeVine's criticism of Vanya is particularly devastating: "Oertalion's (the play's director) choice was to drop into a young cast a visiting 'guest artist' as Vanya, George Axler. Axler, a generation older than his peers here, seems encumbered by the middle-rank actor's reluctance to take any bold chances."

If DeVine found this apt rendition of Chekhov's "Uncle Vanya" boring it can only be because of his admitted inability to follow the rather uncomplicated storyline. (Chekhov is the master of the "Indirect action" play in which dramatic action takes place off stage and the play concentrates on the reactions of the characters to the dramatic events in their lives.) If DeVine feels the production was insufficiently "lively" due to the "impotent" characters half-"drowned" condition, he must recall that the play's subjects are oppressed by the ever mentioned humidity aggravating both family and Russian economic tensions until the storm finally breaks in Scene IV. Conscious of his sound and artistic responsibilities as a writer, Chekhov creates in Uncle Vanya a dramatic atmosphere of mounting frustration and introspective complexity. Vanya is confronted with the tolstoiian dilemma of Christian love as being incompatible with sexual love. Serebriakov, a retired professor, is taunted by a life spent penning platitudes about the art he could never understand because of the academic's inability to grasp the beauty of living. Astrov, who like all of the play's characters feels that life has passed him by, falls in love with the idea of Yelena, a spoiled woman plagued by the fact that to one will ever bother to see what is behind her beauty. The acting in Uncle Vanya is first rate. DeVine does not really debate the quality of the performances he simply bemoans the lack of "bold chances." He finds the production too "serious" and straightforward. There is, admittedly, little "innovation" in the Power Center's rendition of Chekhov's work. The characters remain fully clothed throughout the performance. No song or dance numbers have been added to "spice things up." There is no ironic twist of plot to surprise Chekhov's fans.

"Uncle Vanya" was not designed to fill an evening with light entertainment. If Lawrence DeVine would admit that he prefers his pathetic characters set in action packed, gimicky, non-depressing settings, he could stop discouraging play attendance and find true happiness watching television's situation comedies.

by Stephanie Hazelton
THE ADVENTURES OF PREP 'N TOM
by THE PEARL

"TOM, I JUST REALIZED THAT THE
BEST FILM ABOUT LAW SCHOOL
ISN'T "THE PAPER CHASE" AT ALL!"

"WELL, THEN, WHAT IS?"

"WHY, "THE BIG SLEEP," OF COURSE!"

R.G. BANDSTAND

Dick Clark..........Ned Othman
(Last) Tango.......Carol Sulkes
Hully Gully.......Bob Brandenburg
Big Apple.........Don Parman
Antler Dance......Stew Olson
Bump...............Ken Frantz
Victory Dance.....John Mezzanotte
Bossa Nova.......Dot Blair
Flamenco..........Andrea Sachs
Soupy Shuffle.....Earl Cantwell
Fox Trot.........Sandy Gross
Watusi............Kevin McCabe
Bunny Hop.........Crusader Rabbit
Irish Jig..........Bruce Johnson
Belly Dance......Stephanie Hazelton
Hustle............Dennis Fliedman
Turkey Trot.......Dan Schulman
Funky Chicken....Zieghoff Braintree
Jerk..............Your Choice

TRIAL BY COMBAT AT ARMS

If past experience is to be taken as a guide, anyone considering a judicial clerkship with Judge Christ T. Seraphim of Milwaukee might well consider karate lessons before taking the big step.

Judge Seraphim was decked by a punch from the witness stand in his rematch with defendant James E. Wicks.

Wicks, 24, beginning trial for attempted murder, scaled a railing and hit Seraphim on the jaw as the judge leaned close to ask a question.

Both men fell to the floor and had to be untangled by two deputies and two policemen.

The judge regained his seat, rubbing his jaw.

"I didn't have a chance to throw a fair blow," Seraphim said. "This guy was on top of me before I knew it. And on top of this, I've been having back trouble all day."

Seraphim, 57, had instructed a deputy sheriff to stay near the defendant as he took the stand, recalling that he had had to duck to avoid a five-pound microphone that Wicks threw at him in an earlier meeting.

After the latest round, Wicks was handcuffed and returned to jail. The trial, in which Wicks is accused of stabbing a former girlfriend, was recessed for two days.

Trial practice seminar was never like this.

IF HE SAID IT, IT MUST BE TRUE - FACULTY QUOTE OF THE WEEK

"It is my abiding conviction that most people -- including most law teachers -- don't understand Dunlevy; and I do."

James Martin
§1 Civil Pro
2/18/77
ACROSS
1. One after another.
8. Idiosyncrasy.
13. Unending.
15. Song.
17. Boredom stopper (abbr.).
19. Drawing.
20. Troika.
22. Brass (Lat.).
23. A jack in cribbage.
25. Poetic contraction.
26. Trudge.
28. Classmate Jones, to friends.
31. Move.
32. Patriot.
33. Crease again.
35. Land of Rome (comb. form).
37. Faulty prefix.
38. Peel.
40. Criminal procedure milestone.
42. ______ old men.
43. Univ. in Kalamazoo.
44. Columbus' ship and namesakes.
46. "From every ______ mighty oak. . ."
49. Verne villain.
50. Plug.
52. National teen religious gp.
53. Patriotic org.
55. Wax.
56. "______ semper tyrannis!" (ACROSS, continued)

58. Perilous.
59. Beginning for pect and tain.
60. Sum and Substance man.
62. "______ tuttis."
65. In____.
66. Investigate.
68. Trigonometry items.
70. Tax month.
71. What Hutchins is to Legal Research.

DOWN
1. Heavenly host.
2. Between do and mi.
3. Subjunctive contraction?
4. First three of five.
5. One component of trav. expense.
7. Constitutional law milestone.
10. Adherent or doer (suf.).
11. Descriptive of a dearth.
12. Stage light.
14. _____ Vegas.
16. Fool.
18. Diet dessert.
22. Windowed parlors.
27. Irish surname.
29. Preposition.
30. ______ Saddles.
34. Ones who intone ceaselessly.
36. ______ kind.
37. Execution time, often.
39. Infatuate.
41. "...silk purse out of ______."
45. Greek tragedy features.
47. One brand of cola (abbr.).
48. Front attachment.
51. Ross.
54. Get up.
57. Hack.
58. Nickname for a g.p.
61. Conjunction.
63. Picnic pest.
64. RG chief.
67. Circumference divided by diameter.
69. Therefore.

* 33+. Biblical person.

ANSWERS APPEAR ELSEWHERE IN THIS ISSUE.
FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION PROCEDURE
FOR THE 1977-78 ACADEMIC YEAR

The applications for financial assistance for the 1977-78 academic year, including the Summer Term 1977, Fall Term 1977, and Winter Term 1978, are now available in Room 307 Hutchins Hall.

Although you may apply for financial assistance at any time, due to the difficulty of allocating limited funds, priority will be given to applications submitted prior to April 1, 1977.

The application procedure for financial assistance for the 1977-78 school year (Summer, Fall, and Winter Terms) is as stated below:

1. All students who feel that they will need assistance must complete a 1977-78 Law School Financial Aid Application, regardless of previous financial aid status. These applications will be available in Room 307 Hutchins Hall.

   Please read Part I (the information section) of the application very carefully.

2. All students must complete the 1977-78 Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Service Form (GAPSFAS). The applicants and parents section of this questionnaire must be completed and submitted directly to the Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Service in New Jersey. This form can be picked up at the Financial Aid Office also.

3. Applicants who are applying for assistance for the first time are required to submit, in addition to the GAPSFAS, an official copy of their parents' most recent income tax return. Forms to request an official copy from IRS are available in the Financial Aids Office.

4. Applicants who are applying for assistance for the first time, or those who have assistance and feel that they will have additional need are required to seek out the possibility of aid from state or federally guaranteed student loan programs. Details of these programs are usually available from the individual state authority in charge of the program, or from the participating lending institution. The Financial Aids Office can supply information on some of these programs.

   Please let the Financial Aids Office know whether or not you have been able to receive assistance from this source as soon as possible.

Applicants whose applications are complete and submitted on time, should receive notification by the first week in May for the 1977 Summer Term, and applicants for the 1977-78 Fall and Winter Term should receive notification by the first week in August.
WORK-STUDY INFORMATION
FOR THE 1977 SUMMER TERM and
1977-78 FALL/WINTER TERMS

Applications for the 1977 Summer Term and the 1977-78 Fall and Winter Terms Work-Study Programs are now available in the Financial Aids Office, Room 307 Hutchins Hall. The deadline for completed Work-Study applications for both the Summer Term and the Fall and Winter Terms will be March 15, 1977. All required paperwork must be completed and returned to the Financial Aids Office by this date.

Due to the volume of applications and the limited availability of government funds for the Work-Study applications for Law Students will be accepted for the 1977 Summer Term or the 1977-78 Fall and Winter Terms after the above due date.

If you are eligible for Work-Study and are interested in working out-of-state, it will be necessary for you to complete a supplemental form. Please notify the Financial Aids Office about this as soon as possible, so that the appropriate form can be completed without delay.

"Study Habits and their Effectiveness in Legal Education"

A statistical analysis of the correlation between type and length of study methods and the GPAs of 329 U Indiana first and second year law students.

"Perhaps the most striking finding of the study is that nothing the student does makes nearly as much difference as factors beyond his control. It seems that those who can write good law school exams can do so consistently almost without regard to how or how much they study and that while some skill of skills are measured quite consistently by law exams, those skills cannot be dependably learned by any of the study techniques analyzed."

447: "The most time-consuming of study habits, completion of assignments made by professors, was of very little impact."

BY GOD, I LOVE THE LAW!
Down with Turkeys!

Up the Ducks
The Lawyer's Club Pinball Blues
otherwise known as:

SWEET OLD CHICAGO
Words and music by Robert Johnson

Chorus:

Hey, baby, don't you want to go,
Hey, baby, don't you want to go,
Back to that same old place, child,
Sweet Old Chicago.

One and one is two,
Two and two is four,
I got my bag and suitcase packed,
I swear I'm booked and bound to go.

(Chorus)

Two and two is four,
Four and two is six,
If you're trying to tease me, babe,
You're going to get your business fixed.

(Chorus)

Six and two is eight,
Eight and two is ten,
That girl has tricked you two or three times, child,
She'll trick you once again.

(Chorus)

Michigan State (13 1/2) at Michigan
Illinois (10 1/2) at Minnesota
Wisconsin (1 1/2) at Ohio State
Purdue at Iowa (5 1/2)
Northwestern (8 1/2) at Indiana
Alabama (5 1/2) at Kentucky
Cincinnati at Jacksonville (6 1/2)
Roanoke (25 1/2) at Clemson
Wyoming (8 1/2) at Arizona
Oregon at Washington (4 1/2)
Xavier (21 1/2) at Detroit
North Carolina at Duke (6 1/2)
Manhattan (9 1/2) at Georgetown
La Salle (14 1/2) at Notre Dame
Marquette (4 1/2) at Virginia Tech
Maryland at Virginia (5 1/2)
Wake Forest at NC State (4 1/2)
Providence at St. John's (3 1/2)
Rutgers (6 1/2) at Syracuse
Portland (21 1/2) at San Francisco
California (15 1/2) at UCLA
Tennessee at Georgia (9 1/2)
Louisville (3 1/2) at North Carolina

LEGAL LINES
By
Clarissa

MIXER MINUTIA
(with apologies to T.S. Eliot, il miglior fabbro)

"And I have known the eyes already,
Known them all
The eyes that fix you in a formulated phrase,
And when I am formulated, sprawling on a pin,
When I am pinned and wriggling on the wall,
Then how should I begin
To spit out the butt - ends of my days and ways?
And how should I presume?"

- From "The Lovesong of J. Alfred Prufrock"

Ordinarily, I try to steer clear of mixers. After 15 minutes of "mixing", I usually am left with a profound sense of alienation
that even Mr. Prufrock himself would find enviable. However, in respect to my journalistic obligation to you, my dear readers, I have hazarded Friday's Big Dance. Let us go then, you and I... a chronicle of my night at the mixer:

What a dazzling display of cosmetic magic! All of the bejewelled undergraduate women put us tired old legal ladies to shame. You law school men were all gussied up as well... and you all showed up! There were men there that I have always suspected were cemented to their seats in the library. Imagine... I thought that some of you would have to be dynamited out of your chairs at the end of the semester!

Was it my imagination, or did things get progressively stranger as the evening advanced? What started out as American Bandstand soon began to resemble Law School Satyricon. The first inkling of the surreal quality of the event came as I walked down the stairs to the pinball room. A stranger walking up the stairs addressed me:

Him: What's your name?
Me: Clarissa.
Him: Well, change it!

Not Nice! Someone topped that a few minutes later, however--a gentleman who had heard that I worked for the R.G. came up to me and asked me if I was M M M!! No offense, Mr. Memo Maker, but that kind of threw me for a loop. One of my non-law buddies whom I had brought along to the mixer was getting restless by this point. "I've been here 10 minutes, and I'm not married yet. What's wrong?" I never got a chance to answer her, having been swept away by a sea of writhing dancers. It hardly mattered--the band, composed of Alice Cooper's rejects, would have rendered any further attempt at conversation futile. (I later figured out that the reason that the band was hired was that they offered to pay LSSS for the privilege of playing here, and the Senate, in a frugal mood, agreed). So, unable to make verbal contact, I began to survey the male scenery. My first observation was that two newly married men from my section were there without their wives! Of course, I did what any reasonable person would have done under the circumstances -- I threatened to publish their names this week unless they did the decent thing. And they did--They generously paid my tuition for this semester! Your secret's safe with me, boys!

Well, even this old girl got out on the dance floor. I was sweet talked by a Harvard man (who called me a "hard woman" when I refused to leave with him), and entertained by a reknowned cartoonist. I came close to dancing with a certain Law Review Notable (next time, huh?), and was privileged to talk to a law school man who knew Greg Allman before he knew Cher! Believe it or not, I even did the bump with the President of the Student Senate. (No, M M M... he didn't really trip on his mustache while we were dancing!) Thank you, gentleman, for making the mixer almost painless... nay, even enjoyable.

I am going to leave you with a few metric memories of the mixer that I later penned:

ODE TO A MEET MARKET

Life, my friends, is a law school mixer,
Music, men, and a kegged elixer,
Each man hoping his belching charms
Will lure a girl to his waiting arms.

Law school men--you assume the risk!
You, payor, are the golden fisc.
A legal man is a valued prize,
And thus the gleam in each groupie's eyes.

Undergrad shoppers will all agree--
This beats going to the A & P!
More for your money, pound for pound,
And lots of men to go around.

I heard one gal who was no one's fool,
She'd learned her lessons in Econ school--
"I'll join you out on the dancing floor,
If you've got above a 3 point 4!"

The man was stunned--he was C+ stuff,
But he liked her looks, so he came on tough:
He told her he'd answer her youthful prayers,
And show her his Gilberts if she'd come up-stairs!

Sweet undergrad princesses--listen to me,
And heed what I swear is a genuine plea:
If I were a groupie, and acting quite regal,
I'd never go out with a man who was legal!
He may sound romantic with beer in his belly,
His rhetoric may turn your knees into jelly,
But us legal ladies will give you a warn-ing--
He'll be in the library Saturday morning!!
This week's Newsweek magazine contains an article about the legality of "deprogrammers." It's a fascinating question and I'd like to talk about it in today's column.

For those not familiar with the term, "deprogramming" is a euphemistic term given to the brainwashing techniques applied to people, usually children "kidnapped" by their parents, who have become followers of one of the new cult movements. Ted Patrick was the first that I know of, now there are many others. The techniques of deprogramming areundeniably brainwashing: threats of physical abuse and imprisonment, glaring lights, deprivation of sleep, constant repetition that the person is deranged, mistaken in his beliefs, out of contact with reality. Eventually the person cracks, or recovers, (depending upon your viewpoint) and is restored to the bosom of parents or whoever shelled out the $10,000 to have him deprogrammed (Newsweek figure). Even when done with an accompanying court order, opponents claim deprogramming is a shocking deprivation of civil liberties. But those in favor maintain it is the only way to deal with the problem of people who are already brainwashed by the cult groups. Such people, they claim, cannot be convinced rationally of even the most "obvious" facts. The personality which "breaks" under deprogramming is the false, imposed one, and the real self trapped beneath is thus allowed free. Advocates point proudly to the "graduates" who are thankful for their "deprogramming." Who is right? Both are right. That is why this is an interesting question.

Many of the deprogrammers work on "Moonies," followers of the Rev. Sun Myung Moon. Others work with Hare Krishnas. Scientologists and followers of the Maharaj Ji have also been involved. These are all fields of study which require that the participant give up previous beliefs and activities and take up new beliefs and activities. These are "spiritual organizations." They are organizations, which means they need money to operate. They are spiritual, and like virtually all such groups they advocate a de-emphasis of things material. As long as you are divesting yourself of money, why not divest it in their direction? It makes sense, but we are suspicious. They teach an alternative way of thinking about and handling daily activities. But to get their students to listen to their propositions they must first "deprogram" them of their conventional "programming." Man in the state of nature did not wear suits, work from 9 to 5, etc. etc. We too easily mistake the "conventional" for the "natural." Our primary and secondary school experience, our families and our contemporaries all "program" us. To break us of this the alternative disciplines must first literally brain-wash us. They might use water torture and sleep deprivation, or classes and discussions, but the desired result is always exactly what their opponents claim--a washing away of the conventional viewpoint and standard of behavior and a replacement with their own. (In fact, however, I know of no "cult" movement or discipline which employs methods as questionable as those of some of the deprogrammers).

Even though I believe both sides on this question to have validity, my sympathies lie against the deprogrammers. In many of these cases the kidnapped and deprogrammed offspring are over 21; most are over 18. Although I can empathize with the parent whose beloved straight-A's child with a promising future in etc. is now dancing with shaved head in the street chanting and begging, I believe more strongly that every human being deserves a crack at determining his or her own destiny.

All you readers who smoke pot,
or have used it. Remember in your younger days, how you wouldn't try it because you were "high on life," "didn't need that crutch," weren't the type to "cop out on reality," and after all, "it's illegal you know." Wasn't that asinine? And yet you believed it. You were maintaining a particular viewpoint, and the fact that you were saying dumb things you laugh at now doesn't alter the strength of that past conviction. At the time you would have resent someone "deprogramming" you into smoking, just as today you'd resent and resist your parents or somebody having you deprogrammed into not-smoking. Or how about being deprogrammed back to your virginal views on sexuality? Wouldn't that be fun? Here's one for the other side.

What if the new cult movement were a rabid, violent neo-Nazism? How would you feel about seeing people deprogrammed away from that? And what about the fact that some people are genuinely grateful for their deprogramming? Often people seek out these groups at a time when their lives are confused and uncertain. They want direction and stability at whatever cost and may be at a low point in their ability to discriminate fact from falsehood, legitimate from fraudulent. They may be duped by con-men, or simply overwhelmed by something honest but beyond what they are ready for or really want. Besides, other than some hassle and aggravation—if you are a true believer is there anything seriously damaging about enduring a deprogramming? You can always go back afterwards.

The question is actually more than just one of civil liberties. Just as we cannot physically be in two places at once, we cannot hold two world-views simultaneously. When you are outside Hare Krishna you are alienated by its strangeness. If you're a boor you snicker. When you are inside you marvel at the blindness of those who look at you and can't understand, and what is worse, laugh at what they do not understand. When we are outside anything—it is weird, obsessed, incomprehensible. When we are inside we now understand—it's clear, it's right, we've grown away from that younger-days-foolishness; not realizing that we will eventually be outside again. This too shall pass. This too shall pass. Whether it is love, pinball or politics—there is always an inside-view and an outside-view. And I personally do not like the thought of anybody imposing one or the other on a fellow human being, whatever the circumstance, whatever the motive.

---

**THE ADVENTURES OF PEEP 'N TOM**

"WHEN SPRING IS ON THE WAY, A YOUNG MAN'S THOUGHTS TURN TO...

---

"STRAT-O-MATIC BASEBALL!"

---

"AND THOUGHTS OF LOVE TOO!"
The 1976-77 Stratomatic Football
League season reached its culmination
this past month. Final division standings were as follows:

**AFC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Opp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'72 Pittsburgh</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'73 Oakland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'73 Cincinnati</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'67 Los Angeles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'70 Kansas City</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NFC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Pts</th>
<th>Opp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'73 Dallas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'73 Minnesota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'74 St. Louis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'67 Green Bay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'70 Detroit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the league playoff format, the 2nd and 4th place teams in each division crossed over:

**AFC**

- Pittsburgh
- Minnesota
- Cincinnati
- Green Bay
- Kansas City

**NFC**

- Dallas
- Oakland
- St. Louis
- Los Angeles
- Detroit

The playoffs began with the 5th place team in each division playing the 4th, with the winner to play the 3rd, that winner to play the 2nd, etc. '67 Green Bay, as it did last year, proved tough in the early rounds, beating '70 K.C. and '73 Cinci. soundly before succumbing in a heartbreaker to '73 Minn. 13-10. Meanwhile '70 Detroit, after a disappointing regular season, won hard-fought early victories over '67 L.A. and '74 St. Louis. Then, in a semifinal battle with '73 Oakland that was closer than the final of 20-3, Detroit too bowed out.

The AFC final matched two stingy defenses in the '73 Vikings and '72 Steelers. Pittsburgh, the surprise champion in 1975-76, had parlayed breaks and turnovers into clutch wins all season, and this game proved no exception. They forced six Viking turnovers and suffered none of their own, and held on for a 19-10 victory despite accumulating less than 100 yards of total offense. After deducting sacks, the Steeler pass offense was actually minus yardage.

The NFC final pitted '73 Dallas and '73 Oakland. The Raiders were undefeated in their last ten games, and their defense had given up barely 10 pts. per game during that stretch. The Cowboys finished the season first in the league in rushing offense, total offense, and points scored. Experts believed that if Oakland could keep the game low-scoring and tight it would probably win. However the game proved otherwise, as both teams scored quickly and repeatedly, trading explosive drives. At the end of the first quarter the score was Dallas 21 Oakland 14. In the second quarter the defenses appeared on the field and the half ended Dallas 21, Oakland 17. That was it for Oakland, as Dallas scored two 3rd-quarter TDs and went on to an impressive 35-17 win. Oakland was denied a chance for revenge of its 1975-76 Super Bowl defeat.

Dallas was now looking for some vengeance of its own, having been knocked out in the divisional finals by Pittsburgh the year before. The experts felt the key to the Super Bowl would be turnovers. They did not think Pitt. could completely contain the explosive Dallas offense.

Dallas struck early, Roger Staubach to Otto Stowe for 45 yards to the Steeler 3. But Pittsburgh held, and Toni Fritsch's ten-yard field goal attempt was no good. The Steelers were unable to generate any offense in the early going, and late in the first period Dallas drove again, scoring on a ten-yard pass from Staubach to Billy Joe Dupree. The Steelers remained completely ineffectual on offense, but early in the second period a blocked punt resulted in a Roy Gerela field goal
and Pittsburgh was on the board.

On the next Steeler possession, the first of linebacker D.D. Lewis' two interceptions gave Dallas the ball in Pittsburgh territory. But the Curtain held again, and a 29 yard Dallas field goal attempt was wide. The Steelers took over on their twenty (pre-1974 rules), and immediately suffered a sack. But on the next play QB Terry Bradshaw spotted the Dallas pass defense cheating short and went over the top to flanker Ron Shanklin, who beat his defender and raced 88 yards for the score. The crowd was stunned. The silent Steeler offense had erupted.

Now it was all Pittsburgh. The Cowboys did not pick up another first down the remainder of the half. And in the last two minutes Bradshaw executed a brilliant aerial drive, exploiting weakness in the Dallas secondary to perfection. Preston Pearson plunged in from the two with 15 seconds remaining.


In the third period another Cowboys interception resulted in a 31-yard field goal. And then a precision march, alternating medium passes to the wide receivers and flairs to old pro Walt Garrison (in for the injured Robert Newhouse), culminated in the second Dallas touchdown, a 9-yard pass from Staubach to Garrison. Later in the period a Steeler interception yielded another Gerela field goal, and Pittsburgh took a 20-17 lead into the final quarter.

Both defenses held. With the quarter about half gone, a modest Dallas drive brought it to the Steeler 39. The Pitt defense was playing tight, trying to take away the intermediate yardage and the opportunity for the tying field goal. This left a small hole in the otherwise impene-trable Steeler deep secondary, and Staubach took the chance. He play-actioned into the line, found flanker Stowe two steps past his defender and hit him with a perfect strike. Stowe caught the ball in full stride and tumbled into the endzone. Dallas 24, Pittsburgh 20.

Another Pitt turnover gave the ball back to Dallas, which then drove to a fourth and one at the Steeler 2, with under four minutes left. The question: go for the TD or first down to put it away or take the safe field goal? (Also, Strato time moves slower than NFL time during the middle of a period, but faster at the end, so time was an important factor). The decision—a 9-yard field goal by Fritsch.

Bradshaw had 3 1/2 minutes to make up the seven point deficit. He'd proved surprisingly clutch during the regular season in such situations. With over two minutes remaining the Steelers had reached midfield. But then came their final turnover, a fumble by Franco Harris, recovered by Dallas. Three QB sneaks by Staubach exhausted the Steeler time-outs, and a punt out of bounds inside the Pitt 15 put it out of reach.

Final Score: Dallas 27, Pitt 20.

Calvin Hill, league-leading rusher with over 1500 yards and a 5.3 yds/carry average, was held to 14 yards in 13 carries. Both Cowboy fullbacks were injured, and the total team rushing yardage was 47. But Roger the Dodger was brilliant, hitting 21 of 33 passes for 311 yards and 3 TDs. Terry Bradshaw proved too erratic, hitting several spectacular bombs but consistently missing the short tosses needed to sustain his drives. Franco Harris, 2nd in league rushing, was held in check. But the key was indeed turnovers—Pitt had 4 to Dallas' 3.

The '73 DALLAS COWBOYS, 1976-77 Strato Champions.
BASKETBALL POLL

Last week's poll was won by Milwaukee Brewers' president Bud Selig (his entry was turned in by Charlie Wolff), who went 17-7. Glenn Adelson, Fred Fathe, John Walter and Steve Mehlman were all one game back. Don Parman, who tied for first last week was at the bottom this time at 6-18. The individual median score was 12-12.

This week I really had trouble finding decent games. I guess we couldn't expect Clemson to play anyone too tough since the grueling ACC tourney is coming up soon. Also note that the team that USF is playing is not the Portland State team that includes scoring star Freeman Williams. The rules are the same as always - Circle winners, Cross out losers, and deliver the entry to the box outside Room 100 by 5 p.m. Friday, or to K-43 Lawyers' Club before noon on Saturday.

Michigan State (13 1/2) at Michigan
Illinois (10 1/2) at Minnesota
Wisconsin (1 1/2) at Ohio State
Purdue at Iowa (5 1/2)
Northwestern (8 1/2) at Indiana
Alabama (5 1/2) at Kentucky
Cincinnati at Jacksonville (6 1/2)
Roanoke (25 1/2) at Clemson
Wyoming (8 1/2) at Arizona
Oregon at Washington (4 1/2)
Xavier (21 1/2) at Detroit
North Carolina at Duke (6 1/2)
Manhattan (9 1/2) at Georgetown
La Salle (14 1/2) at Notre Dame
Marquette (4 1/2) at Virginia Tech
Maryland at Virginia (5 1/2)
Wake Forest at NC State (4 1/2)
Providence at St. John's (3 1/2)
Rutgers (6 1/2) at Syracuse
Portland (21 1/2) at San Francisco
California (15 1/2) at UCLA
Tennessee at Georgia (9 1/2)
Louisville (3 1/2) at North Carolina

Tiebreaker: How many rebounds will Phil Hubbard get against MSU?

NAME: __________________________

24