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...and you have the right to remain silent... but not in my class!
MUTINY ON THE BOUNTY

Frank Lloyd had turned The Sea Hawk into one of the great sea epics of the silent screen, so it was fitting that he be chosen by Irving Thalberg to make the first major example of the genre in sound. It became a classic, and far surpassed a remake twenty-seven years later by the same studio in a version whose only “improvement” over the original was the use of color photography.

Charles Nordhoff and James Norman Hall had written a trilogy (Mutiny on the Bounty, Man Against the Sea and Pitcairn Island) based on the true story of the English ship H.M.S. Bounty and the successful mutiny of part of her crew which took place in the late eighteenth century in the South Seas. The film covers only the first two books, detailing the motivations for the mutiny led by Master’s Mate Fletcher Christian against the sadistically cruel Captain Bligh. The highly romanticized account includes an interlude in Tahiti where the crew cavorts with native girls, and the dramatic trial of Midshipman Byam and others, which exposed the barbaric naval code. The picture ends with the band of mutineers settling on Pitcairn.

It is an irresistible adventure story told on the screen with great sweep and narrative skill and acted unforgettably by the best talent Thalberg could muster. Legend has it that Charles Laughton did not want to play Bligh and had to be coaxed; it is one of his best screen performances, often hammy but even that is in key. Clark Gable is a dashing Christian—not very English, true, but a credible hero. Franchot Tone had one of his best roles, too, as Byam, and played it well.

The tremendous success of the picture led to a spate of sea films for years afterward, including, ironically, a remake of The Sea Hawk by another studio, Warner Bros. Mutiny won the Oscar as best film of 1935.

LETTERS

Letter to Malevolent Memo Maker:

Dear MMM:

For about the fourth time this year, I would like to make it clear that LSSS does not collect $20 per semester per student, the Law School does. And LSSS does not get $20 per student per semester, LSSS gets only $5.00 of the $20 fee (ask the Dean where the rest of it goes). And, mixers are only one of many things LSSS does with its money!

Pam Hyde

RELATING TO THE PUBLIC

Is there an organized group, or a public person, anywhere in our country who doesn't complain about "having a bad image" or "getting a bad press"? I have yet to find one, including, ironically, public relations practitioners and news people, the builders and conveyors of "images."

Lawyers, it seems, are constantly reading, and taking seriously, survey results that rank them in public esteem at a level with morticians and just below butchers and above hairdressers. There appear to be three sacrosanct rules followed by every speaker or writer on the subject of lawyer public relations:

(1) Quote de Tocqueville, who wrote many complimentary things about lawyers.

(2) Immediately contrast something de Tocqueville with Sandburg's "hearse horse" poem, or, even better, with Shakespeare's line about "killing the lawyers."

(3) Cite one of those surveys - even if it was conducted among six people on a street corner in Keokuk - that demonstrates that people "think lawyers are thieves."

(Incidentally, it always bothers me to see that Shakespeare quote used, since it is virtually always quoted out of context. The quote comes in a scene in which Jack Cade, "a rebel," discussed his plan to be-
come king. Cade says, "There shall be no
money; and all shall eat and drink on my
score; and I will apparel them all in one
livery, that they may agree like brothers
and worship me their lord." Cade's accom­
plice, Dick the Butcher, then suggests that
the rebels begin by killing all the lawyers.

Obviously, this suggestion is made not be­
because Dick believes that lawyers are bad
people but out of the knowledge that, by
killing the lawyers, Cade and his people
would remove the strongest opposition to
his plan to take over the country.)

Lawyers, like everyone else these days, are
paranoid about what the press says about
them and what the public thinks about them.
Too many of us, including high-level repre­
sentatives of the organized bar, think that
"the consumers are out to get us" and "the
Antitrust Division is out..." and so on,
ad nauseum.

This attitude is negative and self-defeating,
and one often finds that those who complain
most loudly are those who try the least to
and achieve the least to remedy the situa­
tion. Public relations is one of the sub­
jects about which the bar talks very much
and does very little - and when I say
"public" relations, I mean all of our pub­
lies: the community, the judiciary, the
press, our clients, etc.

I suggest that the first thing we do is get
rid of the word, "image," as it relates to
public relations. The dictionary defines
"image", in this context, as "a mental
picture of something not actually present." The bar, and any group or individual wanting
to create a favorable impression in the
public mind, must present a picture of what
it is, not what it wants people to think it
is. This is the difference between shadow
and substance - between a cosmetic approach
and a realistic one. Let's show the warts and
the moles and the pimples; let's admit
that they are imperfections and point out
that we're taking medicine to cure them.

I further suggest that we stop thinking a­
about the bar as "the second profession." Lawyers too often compare themselves to
doctors, in a self-deprecating way. Many
Chicagoans refer to Chicago as "the second
city," comparing it unfavorably to New York City. Just as living in Chicago has taught
me that it's not inferior to any city, work­
ing with lawyers has demonstrated that the
term need not feel less important or valuable
than any other profession.

And let's maintain a free and open working
relationship with the press and work to
strengthen and improve that rapport where­
ever it exists. We should avoid that hide­
ous phrase, "no comment," and attempt to
avoid "misspeaking" to the press (a word
that my dictionary doesn't define, but that
I think is synonymous with "lying."

Finally, lawyers and bar associations
should do positive things--not dance around
them, not just talk about them: Become
part of the community; eliminate pomposity
disguised as dignity; deal with people as
though they're equals, even if they aren't
lawyers.

Public relations has been defined as "doing
good things and letting people know about
them." What more do we need? How much
simpler can a job be?

--Alan E. Kurland
Bar Leader, January 1976
Acknowledging "new and acrimonious tensions" between legal education and the organized bar, the new president of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) says legal education needs financial support of lawyers and judges in order to carry out needed reforms.

At the same time, AALS President Francis A. Allen has condemned efforts on the part of the bar and the judiciary to control curriculum and dictate other changes at law schools.

Allen, a University of Michigan law professor and former dean of U-M Law School, said:

"This is an era in which our institutions have sustained serious losses in confidence. In such a time it is not surprising that legal education should be subjected to criticism.

"The bar itself has felt the lash of public criticism," Allen said. "And in some measure the criticisms of the law school by the profession represents its reaction to these attacks."

Allen assumed the presidency of the AALS Dec. 27, succeeding Charles Myers of Stanford Law School. The association, which works to raise standards of legal education, includes 132 leading American law schools.

"In his presidential address before the AALS in Washington, D.C., Allen noted financial problems facing many law schools.

"In these days of fiscal stringency we urgently need the support of the bar and the judiciary to assist in devising new, even radically innovative, bases for the financial support of legal education. Without such support many of the reforms most sincerely urged upon the law schools by some lawyers and judges are doomed to fail before they start."

Allen cited a number of recent proposals to control curriculum content at law schools ---such as the so-called "Clare proposal" in New York and "Rule 13" in Indiana--- as being a "form of governmental interference that cuts into the sinews of American legal education."

Under the Clare proposal, lawyers who wish to practice in two federal district courts in New York City would have been required to study a specified curriculum at law school. The proposal has since been rejected by federal judges in New York.

The new Indiana rule, adopted by the Indiana Supreme Court and scheduled to take effect in 1977, requires to study specific course in order to take the Indiana bar examination.

Allen said these proposals, "taken against the advice of most law teachers who have addressed the subject," would disturb "a long-established division of labor wherein the content of educational programs has, in general, been determined by the schools and the testing of proficiency of applicants for professional practice has been performed by the bar and the courts."

Allen also took issue with a proposal before the American Bar Association---which is the major accrediting agency for law schools---calling for the elimination of a system of tenure for law professors as a requirement for a school's accreditation.

The U-M professor noted that the proposal is "supporting by some on assumption of widespread incompetence and sloth among law teachers that many of us would find unsupported by our own experiences and observation."

Allen noted that Chief Justice Warren Burger of the U.S. Supreme Court, among others, has questioned the competence of today's law graduates.

"It is a curious fact," Allen said, "that protest about the trial competence of young lawyers has reached a crescendo at the very moment when our students have been receiving more instruction and practical experience in litigation than ever before."

The U-M professor also disputed the notion that, because of the broadened scope of modern legal scholarship, professors have lost interest in problems of practicing lawyers.

The interdisciplinary nature of modern legal research---which borrows from such fields as the social sciences and economics---has led to an "extraordinary advance in the scope
and sophistication of much contemporary law writing," Allen said.

"There are few competent and conscientious law teachers or scholars who would today question the penetrating power of economic analysis in the consideration of some legal questions, the utility of techniques of social research developed outside the law schools, or the insights gained by viewing contemporary problems from the broad perspectives of historical sequences.

"These enrichments of law teaching and scholarship are available, not because they conform to current intellectual fads, but because they respond to felt needs experienced by competent legal scholars in the course of their work." And, said Allen, "Many lawyers have enjoyed the fruits of such scholarship in their practice of law."

Prof. Allen is the third member of the U-M law faculty to head the AALS. The late Prof. Edson R. Sunderland of U-M Law School was president of the association in 1930, and Prof. Alfred Conard served as president in 1971.

FORD RENEWS CALL FOR MANDATORY SENTENCING IN ARTICLE FOR ABA MAGAZINE

President Gerald R. Ford has renewed his call for mandatory minimum prison sentences in the winter issue of Criminal Justice, a quarterly publication of the American Bar Association's Section of Criminal Justice.

Sentencing is also discussed in articles by U.S. District Court Judge Constance Baker Motley, New York City, and Prof. Herbert S. Miller, co-director of the Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Both are on the criminal justice section's council.

"My philosophy of mandatory imprisonment does not envision vindictive punishment of the criminal, but protection of the innocent victim," President Ford said. "Reasonable mandatory minimum sentences can restore the sense of certain imprisonment essential to preserve the deterrent impact of criminal law."

Ford said that mandatory prison terms should be given to persons convicted in federal court of using a dangerous weapon, hijacking an aircraft, kidnapping and trafficking in hard drugs.

Repeat offenders who commit federal crimes with or without a weapon, which cause or have a potential to cause personal injury, should also receive a mandatory sentence, he said.

A federal sentencing law would serve as a model for state legislation, he said.

Most violent crime is covered by state rather than federal law, he noted.

Judge Motley does not oppose mandatory minimum sentences per se, but she advocates a graduated series of penalties with a harsher sentence given for repeated crime or for particularly heinous crimes.

Miller argues that mandatory minimum sentences have little deterrence value and that juries often balk at convicting defendants who face unreasonably long prison sentences. Miller suggests an alternative that would favor a presumption, but not a requirement of imprisonment in certain crimes.

The ABA generally disapproves of mandatory minimum sentences, and its Standards for the Administration of Criminal Justice contain a presumption in favor of probation where appropriate.
ABA NATIONAL CONFERENCE TO EXAMINE ORGANIZED BAR ROLE IN FEDERAL JUDGE SELECTION

The organized bar's role in the selection of federal judges will be subjected to in-depth review by an American Bar Association national conference at Vanderbilt University March 12-13, in Nashville, Tennessee.

"One of the most important functions performed by the ABA is its long-standing assistance in the selection of federal judges," said ABA President Lawrence E. Walsh, New York City. "This conference will concentrate on ways the organized bar can improve its participation and will seek to increase public awareness and understanding of these activities."

Walsh pointed out that the ABA's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has been involved in the selection process for more than 20 years, and has "continuously re-examined its standards and procedures."

"The conference will receive the committee's standards and procedures, the criteria for the appointment of its members, and the appropriate role of the association and state and local bar associations in working with the Senate in the judicial selection process," Walsh said.

A host of major national figures drawn from industry, labor and government as well as members of the judiciary and legal profession have been invited to participate in conference discussions.

Discussion leaders will include members of the Senate, former officials of the Department of Justice, and others familiar with the judicial selection process.

Walsh said methods will be proposed for more effective relations with political parties and their leaders.

The validity of the ABA judicial screening process will be examined, as will the problems of confidentiality and openness in the selection machinery.

Programs useful to senators in choosing candidates for submission to the President will also be discussed.

The conference will also examine the role of the ABA's standing committee in presenting its conclusions to the Senate.

Conference director will be Ernest C. Friesen, 6 Carriage Lane, Littleton, Colo. 80121, (303-771-8021).

SUMMER VISITING FACULTY

PATRICIA A. KING is regularly a member of the law faculty at Georgetown University. Previously, she served as Special Assistant to the Chairman of EEOC and as Deputy Director of the Office for Civil Rights, HEW. She will teach the course in Enterprise Organization during the eight week term.

PAUL M. BATOR is regularly a Professor of Law at Harvard. He is a co-editor of the current edition of Hart & Wechsler's Federal Courts and The Federal System. He will teach Federal Courts during the first five weeks.

JAMES K. LOGAN is a partner in a law firm in Olathe, Kansas, where he specializes in a corporate practice. He served as Dean of the University of Kansas Law School and has taught at Harvard, Stanford and Texas, as well as Kansas. He is a co-editor of a leading casebook in Future Interests. He will teach Business Planning during the first five weeks.

BARBARA A. BABCOCK is a member of the Stanford faculty. For five years, she served as Director of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia. She will teach Civil Procedure with Professor Carrington to the summer entering first year students.

DAVID G. EPSTEIN is a Professor of Law at the University of Texas. He and Professor Martin are jointly editing a book on Commercial Law. He is a previous visitor to the University of Michigan. He will be teaching Creditors Rights in the second five weeks.

JOHN H. LANGBEIN will be visiting from the University of Chicago. His book is Prosecuting Crime in the Renaissance: England, Germany, France (1974). As the title indicates, he is accomplished both as historian and comparatist. He has been a resident member of Max Planck Institutes in Frankfurt and Freiburg. He will teach Comparative Law in the second five weeks.
How does utility regulation work?

Too often, the scenario looks like this: (1) a company regulated by the government decides what it wants; (2) the company presents the plan to its regulatory agency for approval, alleging benefits to the company and consumers; (3) the company claims to have studied, but really just ignores, alternative plans it doesn't want; (4) the company persuades the agency's staff to go along with the idea; (5) the company gets approval for the plan.

That's almost what happened to Michigan Bell Telephone Company's application to the Michigan Public Service Commission for permission to begin charging for directory assistance. But not quite.

Last March, Bell asked the commission to allow a charge of 20¢ per call for each directory assistance call above three per month. Pages of statistics were presented to show the need for and the benefits which would result from its plan.

The company stated that directory assistance calls had increased twice as fast as the number of telephones over the past 15 years, and that operator costs had increased more than 400% during the same period.

A small percentage of customers, it claimed, were making a disproportionate number of calls to directory assistance each month, while the majority made little or no use of the service. Yet all customers paid for it as part of every phone bill.

A charge for directory assistance would encourage more customers to use the directory, and make those who ignored it pay for the luxury. Thus, the cost of providing the service would be more equitably distributed. And, by decreasing labor costs while raising revenue, some $10 million would be saved. This savings, the company promised, would be passed back to its customers.

Sounds good, doesn't it.

Unfortunately, the plan had a number of defects.

First, the charge would apply whether or not the requested number was accurately listed in your phone book. Thus, you would pay 20¢ each for requests for new listings, numbers not published at customer request, numbers printed incorrectly, and numbers of customers whose service had been disconnected.

Second, you would pay 20¢ for directory assistance calls for numbers beyond your local directory, but within your area code. Thus an Ann Arbor customer looking for a Detroit number would be charged 20¢, even though the Ann Arbor directory does not include Detroit listings.

Because it didn't seem fair to charge people for calling directory assistance when they had no choice in the matter, PIRGIM intervened in the case. PIRGIM was particularly concerned about the effects of the plan on students, who are relatively transient and who might, therefore, have a greater need than other groups to use directory assistance. PIRGIM's opposition was joined by Attorney General Frank J. Kelley.

Hearings were held during the summer. Witnesses were extensively cross-examined (more than a thousand pages of testimony were taken), data was analyzed, briefs and counter-briefs filed. David Klein, a U-M law student, spent a good part of the summer helping prepare PIRGIM's case.

During the proceedings, it was revealed that the company had understated the costs and overstated the benefits of its plan. The "analysis" of alternative plans had been slipshod. Michigan Bell had paid little attention to fairer plans in effect elsewhere, such as Canada's which charges only if you request a number already in your local directory. The company admitted that directories become as much as 20% obsolete by the time they are replaced.

Despite these and other weaknesses in the company's case, the Public Service Commission staff recommended a slightly modified version of the company proposal to the Commission.

Finally, the case reached the Commissioners for a decision. On January 5, the Commission unanimously rejected the company/staff position, citing the doubtful benefits, the new inequities the plan would create, and the failure to assess alternatives.

Apparently organized consumer advocacy can make a difference in the all-too-typical regulatory scenario.
COMMUNITY ARTS AUDITORIUM, CASS AVENUE, DETROIT, MICHIGAN ON THE WAYNE CAMPUS
SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1976
OPEN TO ALL LAW STUDENTS

PROGRAM

9:00 a.m. PREPARATION FOR TRIAL--THE FINISHING TOUCHES
THEODORE SACHS, ESQ.
Marston, Sachs, Nunn, Kates, Kadushin & O'Hare
Putting the case together...final trial strategy...discovery checklist...
the trial plan...anticipating objections...assembling and charting documentary
proof...the anatomy of the trial.

9:25-9:55 THE OPENING STATEMENT--PAUL A. ROSEN, ESQ.
Goodman, Eden, Millender, Goodman & Bedrosian
Length and detail...parading the facts in persuasive order and tone...
objectionable arguments...use of visual aids...integration of opening statement
with witnesses' expected testimony.

9:55-10:30 DIRECT AND REDIRECT EXAMINATION--ELLIOTT S. HALL, ESQ.
Hall, Stone, Allen, Archer & Glenn, P.C.
Preparation, order and technique...outline of testimony of lay witness...
appraisal and handling of unfavorable aspects of case...avoiding leading
questions...keeping testimony bright...tactical use of documentary proof...
anticipating probable impeachment...utilizing visual evidence...offers
of proof...permissible scope of redirect examination and rebuttal proof...
choice of subjects and saving witnesses for rebuttal.

10:45-11:20 TRIAL EVIDENCE--JAMES K. ROBINSON
Honigman, Miller, Schwartz & Cohn
Objections...an outline of the law of evidence...comparative review of
Michigan common law and the federal rules of evidence.

11:20-11:55 CROSS-EXAMINATION--BARRY P. WALDMAN, ESQ.
Marston, Sachs, Nunn, Kates, Kadushin & O'Hare
Reasonable objectives...usual mistakes...preparing your witness for cross-
examination...selectivity...counsel's conduct...impeachment...examination of
adverse witnesses...obtaining responsive answers...handling certain types of
witnesses.

12:00-1:15 LUNCH UNIVERSITY CENTER BUILDING
Luncheon speaker: The Honorable James L. Ryan, Justice, Michigan Supreme Court
Topic: A JUDGE'S VIEW OF TRIAL PRACTICE

1:25-1:55 NON-VERBAL BEHAVIOR IN THE COURTROOM--PROFESSOR JOHN REED
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL

1:55-2:25 THE EXPERT WITNESS--MS. CYNTHIA GITT
Director, Employment Discrimination
Selection and use...preparation--yours and the witness'...the initial conference...
direct examination...anticipating cross examination...cross examination of
OPPONENT'S expert witness.
2:25-2:55 THE CLOSING ARGUMENT--ROBERT A. ZEFT, ESQ.

Planning...use of daily transcript or trial notes...the outline...comment on failure to produce witnesses...manner of delivery--catching and keeping the jury's attention...persuasion...use of visual evidence...logic--circumstantial evidence--let the jury work...special situations...rebuttal.

3:00-5:30 TRIAL DEMONSTRATION--GEORGE J. BEDROSIAN, ESQ.

Goodman, Eden, Millender, Goodman & Bedrosian

Trial of a personal injury case

JACK R. SULLIVAN, ESQ. (tentative)

Dice, Sweeney & Sullivan, P.C.

5:30-5:45 CRITIQUE OF TRIAL

Participation by jurors, judge, witnesses, counsel and attendees.

TRIAL PRACTICE SEMINAR -- SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1976

COMMUNITY ARTS AUDITORIUM - WAYNE CAMPUS

NAME: ________________________________

ADDRESS: ________________________________

LAW SCHOOL: __________________________ Year of Graduation: ____________

No Registration Fee

Luncheon: $5.50 Yes _______ No _______

Luncheon Speaker: The Honorable James Ryan, Michigan Supreme Court Justice

Make checks for the luncheon payable to: Wayne State University Law School (WSU) Student Board of Governors

CAVEAT: The luncheon will be limited to 425 people.

MAIL TO:

ELEESHA SOBLE, PROGRAM COORDINATOR
1045 EAST HOODWARD HEIGHTS, APARTMENT 308
HAZEL PARK, MICHIGAN 48030

OR

DELIVER TO:

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
LAW LIBRARY BUILDING
ROOM 252
We need your help! If you have accepted a job for summer or full-time, please report it to the Placement Office as soon as possible. You may use the form on the table outside Room 100, or the space below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Expected graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I have taken a job with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City &amp; State</th>
<th>Starting salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How did you obtain your job?  
- through interviewing at Law School  
- through a notice on the bulletin board  
- own initiative  
- other

Did you have a clerkship- with whom?

**********  **********  **********  **********  **********

If you have not accepted a position, please fill out the section below, or the form outside Room 100:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employer desired</th>
<th>Kind of practice desired</th>
<th>Location preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please rank in order of importance (1,2,3) after above items.

Have you been actively looking for a position? 

What have you done so far in terms of interviewing, mail campaign, etc. 

What do you think the Placement Office should be doing to assist you? 

**********  **********  **********  **********  **********

Please help us in gathering the above information. You may return the form the box outside Room 100, or drop it off in the Placement Office.

Thank you!
I have taken a (permanent job, summer clerkship) with:

____________________________________
Name of firm, company, or agency

____________________________________
Street address

City __________________________ State ______

starting salary __________________________
(this information will be kept confidential)

How did you obtain your job?

☐ Through interviewing at the Law School

☐ Through a notice from the bulletin board

☐ Through the assistance of a Law School faculty member

☐ Other: __________________________

3rd year students:

Did you have a summer clerkship? _____________

____________________________________
Name of firm, company or agency

City __________________________ State ______

The University of Michigan
Law School Placement Office
210 Hutchins Hall
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
LSSS

LAW SCHOOL STUDENT SENATE MINUTES
January 22, 1976

The meeting was called to order at approximately 6:00 pm in the Faculty Dining Room of the Lawyers Club. Present were Pam Hyde, Jon Forman, George Vinyard, Otila Sulkes, Jon Karp, Jeanette Rameur, Gwen Mosley, Paul Ruschmann, Dave Dawson, Bertie Butts, and Phyllis Rozof. The minutes of the last meeting was approved.

Rate Committee

Joe Ayaub asked that the Senate appoint the students to the Rate Committee: George Vinyard, Joe Ayaub, Beth McWilliams, St. Clair Davis, and Dan Nadis. A motion to this effect with one Senator opposed. Subsequent discussion centered on the desirability of the Lawyers Club menu vis-a-vis the University master menu.

All-campus Constitution

Pam Hyde reported that an all-campus student government constitutional convention was convening January 28, 1976, and that the LSSS was entitled to representation. George Vinyard volunteered to attend the first meeting as a liaison from the Law School Student Senate.

LSSS Constitution

The major part of the meeting was spent discussing the draft of a new constitution for the Senate.

National Lawyers Guild

Susan Gzesh from the National Lawyers Guild asked that the Senate allocate funds to the NLG for the purpose of sending a delegate to the national convention in Houston. (When passing the budget last Spring, the Senate had underestimated the cost of this trip by about $72.) The Senate passed a motion to increase the NLG travel budget by $72 to cover travel expenses and registration fee for one delegate to the national convention. A motion was also passed that the Senate recommend to the Dean that he provide funds for an additional person to go to this convention.

LSSS Meeting Time Change

A motion by Barbara Harris that future Senate meetings begin at 6:30 p.m. on Thursdays passed. It was also decided to hold a special meeting Tuesday, Feb. 23 1976 in order to finish discussing the proposed LSSS constitution.

Sexism


The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Phyllis Rozof

Treasurer's Statement 12-31-75

REVENUES
Pinball $ 3200
Vending 1170
Movies 140
Mixers 520
Std Fac Dir 940
Std Fees 7590
Std Gov't Refund 600
Res Gestae 4700

$18920

EXPENDITURES
LSSS Committees $ 580
Film 2530
Social 730
Sports 190
Speakers 270
Senate Operating 840
Senate Cont 5140

Organizations
Ad Hoc Players -
B.L.S.A. 990
Env Law Society 410
Feminist Legal 50
Int Law Society 330
La Raza 100
Law Spouses 40
Lawyers Guild 180
Legal Aid 400
Mental Health 10
P.A.D. 140

"Statement" Cont. on p. 14
Revenues over expenditures 12-31-75

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P.I.L.S.} & 10 \\
\text{Res Gestae} & 1880 \\
\text{Section V} & - \\
\text{W.L.S.} & 440 \\
\text{Misc} & 5050 \\
\text{Std-Fac Dir} & 700 \\
\text{Vending} & 990 \\
\text{Prior Year} & 20 \\
\text{Unknown} & 140 \\
\text{Lockers} & 3970 \\
\text{Total} & 5820 \\
\text{Revenues over expenditures} & 16010 \\
\end{array}
\]

Cash Surplus start of year $1660
Estimate of funds available from contingency fund and group und. spending or added revenues $3000

Monies available for appropriation $4660

B. Butts
Treasurer 01-26-76

"Life is just a bowl of hockey pucks."
- David Eisenhower Nixon
(or is it the other way)
[who knows? he goes both ways, doesn't he?]

"He oughta' know."
- Don Rickles

"A puck is a puck is a puck."
- B. Shakespeare
[the "B." stands for "Bill" you pedestrian turkeys!]

"I am not ... a hockey puck."
- Duck Nixon ("It's just that I've been iced.")
[I'd agree with that about the icing. Icing is when the puck goes so far that it finally crosses the thin red line at the other end of the rink. Well Nixon sure did cross that thin red line ... of the mind!]

"The weekly Penalty Box"

boxtheweeklypenaltyboxtheweeklypenaltybox

-- the proverbial SIN BIN --

"I am not ... a hockey puck."
- Duck Nixon ("It's just that I've been iced.")
Yes hockey fans, it's back into the arena we dive! Last week, the Student Redwings were clobbered by the Faculty Bruins. Despite the valiant efforts of Argie Ant who returned to give us a little glimpse of the old goal-tending we came to know and love, the Redwing defense literally crumbled. Completely intimidated by the roughhouse antics of the ever-tough Bruins, the Students backed down at every opportunity! The Bruins' play was so obvious that numerous penalties were called, but the Students were unable to capitalize on even one person-up situation. It was a shoddy performance by a team already weak in all positions. The key question now is whether the Redwings will be able to bounce back and offer at least some weak but stout-hearted resistance in their upcoming games.

Penalties:
"Big Doug" Kahn - 2:00 bench minor for making an illegal player change
"Smokin' Joe" Vining - 2:00 minor for roughing; 2:00 minor for slashing; 5:00 major for fighting
"Tiny Tom" Green - 2:00 minor for delay of game (hiding the puck)
Ann Arbor - 2:00 minor for flagrant and outrageous icing
"Roger the Dodger" - 5:00 major for delay of game (hiding the puck and not giving it back)

In other action around the league, the play was furious but rather confused. The Russians, who stormed off the ice in Philadelphia after a penalty was not called in a game last month, did a turnaround in a game in a country on the coast of Africa when they stormed on the ice when the U.S. tried to call a "too-many-men-on-the-ice" penalty.

Fans are still buzzing about the penalty which was not called against PIRGIM this month. PIRGIM used the same technique to collect money for its own coffers that mail order rip-off houses have been trying to use for years. They used the old "We'll bill you now and if you don't take some affirmative action showing that you don't want to buy the product, then you've bought it!" ploy. When a group claiming to be a consumer advocate uses methods like these, you've got to wonder just how concerned they are about the consumer! Can you imagine the stink they would raise if the Republican Party of the City of Ann Arbor, or the real estate landlords group tried to raise money this way?

[P.S. - if you're wondering what I'm talking about and really don't know ... on your bill for tuition, you were charged for a donation to PIRGIM. The only way you can get that donation off of your bill for tuition is to either fill out some form, complete with proper name, signature and student I.D. number and mail it off to the appropriate agency, or fill out the same form and walk it down to the appropriate agency. Sounds to me like I got sent a package full of Super Duper Plastic Magnifi-Dishes which, if I don't mail back to the manufacturer (complete with my name, rank and serial number, birthdate, marital status, annual income, age, measurements, and the number of times I go to the bathroom each day), I owe them for the Magnifi-Dishes! Pretty cute, huh?]

"Sometimes we is the stick-or, an' sometimes we is the stick-ee"
-Flip Wilson

"An' sometimes, you can just STICK IT!"
-The Fonz

"Frustration and lack of motivation may manifest themselves in many ways. Incompetance is just one of those."
-B. Garbage Allison

(I don't know if this reading audience has been told yet - or is ready for - of one of the secrets of life for any would-be hot shot lawyers. The real secret of life is to settle down in a nice quiet town and open up a barbershop. That way, what with a law degree and all, your advice could enjoy the "qualifications" of a lawyer and the common sense persuasiveness of a barber. And from a professional point of view, it would save on trying to advertise for both services. One sign could do it all.

Come in and get clipped!

Burgess' barbershop and clip joint!

Why get scalped by two different people? Have it done to you all in one sitting!)

"Eat" cont. on p. 19
ARGIE ANT

TRILOGY OF THE WHISTLE

PART TWO

IT? WHO'S GOT WHAT?

CUT DA ABBOTT AN' COSTELLO, DA WHISTLE! WHO'S GOT DA WHISTLE?

YOU MEAN THIS?

YES, YES, FINALLY, AFTER ALL THESE WEEKS AND MONTHS, I'VE GOT IT, DO YOU REALIZE THE TROUBLE I'VE GONE TO TO FIND THIS LITTLE DEVIL?

ANYWAYS, YER SAFE NOW, G'NIGHT, KIDS...

WHO WAS THAT GUY?

THE RUMPLED SUIT, THE SKINNY BLACK TIE, THE OVERWEARING CONCERN FOR THE WELFARE OF SMALL BUGS... WHO ELSE COULD IT HAVE BEEN...?

RAH LP NADER

WELL, I GUESS THAT'S THE END OF THAT; NO WHISTLE... NO REVOLUTION

Yeah, except for one thing, ARGIE... I SWITCHED Whistles on him... Let's GO

FOR THOSE WHO MISSED OUR FIRST INSTALLMENT, TOUGH SHIT... 

AWRIGHT, INSECTS, UP AGAINST DA WALL DERE, I AIN'T GOT ALL NIGHT

DAT'S RIGHT, SPREAD 'EM OUT, KAMISAR TEACHES YOURE GUYS PRETTY GOOD. NOW, WHICH ONE OF YOURE HAS GOT IT?
JUST THEN....

BRR-INNGG

NOW WHO'D CALL YOU AT THIS HOUR OF THE NIGHT?

BRR-INNGG

I DUNNO MIKE, BUT IT MUST BE IMPORTANT OR THEY WOULDN'T BE CALLING SO LATE

HELLO....?

HELLO MR. ANT, MY NAME IS SWAIVE, ARTHUR SWAIVE... WE TALKED THIS AFTERNOON IN MY OFFICE IN DETROIT. DO YOU RECALL?

YES, I RECALL VIVIDLY....

... AS I WAS LEAVING, YOU SUGGESTED I TRY TO GET MY G.P.A. UP TO 3.5, SO YOU COULD BE SURE I WAS SERIOUS ABOUT LAW AS A CAREER

HA, HA, JUST A LITTLE TEST...

IN FACT, IT WAS A TEST YOU PASSED WITH FLYING COLORS... THAT LITTLE HAND GESTURE YOU MADE SHOWED YOU HAVE SPUNK

YEAH, SORRY ABOUT THAT, BUT AFTER FIVE INTERVIEWS LIKE THAT.... I UNDERSTAND PERFECTLY MY BOY, I FELT EXACTLY THE SAME WAY WHEN DAD CRITICIZED MY I.R FROM D.C.L.... ANYWAY, I'D LIKE TO OFFER YOU A POSITION... ON CERTAIN CONDITIONS

WHAT KIND OF A POSITION, AND WHAT CONDITIONS?

WELL, I COULD OFFER YOU A CLERKSHIP AT $300 A WEEK.... IF YOU JUST TURN OVER THE WHISTLE

HOW ABOUT AN ASSOCIATESHIP AT $35,000 PER YEAR....?
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The reaction to my last column was amazing.
And as for that one dear reader who ex­pressed extremely strong feelings--you missed, Turkey!

For those who tuned in late (or slept thru last week), this column is devoted to the principles held in highest regard by all law students, namely, mindless blather, illogical and/or improbable observations, terrible puns, and whatever else filters thru gray matter. (It would be "white matter", but I forgot to take my laundry home over break). All contributed ideas are welcome. All contributed cash is even more welcome--and between the two of us, we'll find some way to make it all deductible. We also take MasterCharge.

Thinking of taxes, there's good news for some of you that took Taxation last semester.
The exams are now graded, and only two persons made illegal deductions on the sample 1040. The other 159 of you, of course, will have to take the class over again.

Personal to the RG Editor: I could have lived without the listing as "Dumbo" in last week's masthead. Two weeks I've worked for you, and already you're getting insulting. I hope your blue pencil breaks.

Have you noticed the posters advertising a contest with a top prize of a pound of Columbian? Now that's playing for high stakes!

What a fast ten grand to finance the outrageous tuition (or a trip to Jamaica)? Here's how: (1) Wait for a dark night, with lots of snow and ice on the ground. (2) Walk between the Law Club dining room and Hutchins. (3) Recover from the injuries sustained in the fall. (4) Get a good negligence lawyer, and sue the school.

Dear Campus Parking Office: I paid a pile of cash for a parking space near the Quad. I've only parked there a few times since the last snow, due to all the illegally-parked cars (which you refuses to tow away). Probably just as well, though; I was saved the frustration of using a lot that has yet to be plowed. The last time I was able to park there, someone did about $100 damage to the car. I've gotten a few tickets since I had to park on the street, which I'm forwarding to you. Need any suggestions as to where to shove the tickets? Dis­gustedly yours, MMM.

Do you have a pet peeve? (Keep it on a leash, please). As a service, "Read-Only Memories" will denounce any and all persons, places, or things that are troubling your little mind. In the finest of traditions, this service will only cost 13 silver dollars per peeve (sorry, no contingency fees allowed). However, for this week only, we're holding a special "Shaft Your Neighbor" Sale, at the ridiculously low, low price of only $9.98! Call now, and you'll receive, absolutely free, a handy "Mini-Shaft", complete with all attachments (and liens). Call right now, operators are standing by (bunch of damn law students swiped the chairs). Such a deal I have for you!

For those wishing to use the "Shaft" service, you may have some trouble finding me. If so, just leave a message under a rock, with one of the squirrels on the Quad, or at the local massage parlor. As soon as I get a reasonably firm offer in response to the last column's request, you can cancel that last spot.

There's an ugly rumor around that I'm a male chauvinist-started, no doubt, by an ugly libber. Not true! I haven't chained my girlfriend to the stove for at least a week. I even like her french fries.

"Poor Adam and Eve! Had there been 10 lawyers and a judicial system at the Garden of Eden, they would still be running around, blissfully naked, on appeal,"--Detroit Free Press, January 22nd.

The amorous activities of two dolphins at the state-supported Detroit zoo have recently been causing problems; the little old ladies were more than a little shocked it seems. Heathcliff Ranschatter, the Chief Curator, fortunately found a solution--when a few pounds of raw meat (preferably from some sea bird species) were mixed into their usual food, the dolphins lost all interest in each other. Last Saturday, Ranschatter was taking their food to the tank, and encountered a rather elderly "King of the Beasts" on the sidewalk. The animal was quite tame (it roams freely over the zoo grounds, and seems to enjoy all the atten-
tion visitors give it), so Ranschatter stepped over it and continued towards the tank. Moments later, he was arrested by Federal agents and charged with violating 18 U.S.C. §6972—Transporting gulls across a state line for immoral purposes.

Look, if you're expecting classy humor, what are you doing reading the RG?

That's all for this week, campers. Now that you've read the RG, go back to sleep. You know the professor isn't going to say anything important anyway.

"FIRST JOB INTERVIEW"
--an anonymous fantasy

Employer: Ms. Doe, you have an interesting schedule here.
Ms. D: Well, no. Actually, I hate criminals.
Employer: Oh. Then you want to be a prosecutor?
Ms. D: No, I hate cops, too.
Employer: Well, then you must want to be a family lawyer?
Ms. D: No, I hate children. I mean, I don't hate them, but they don't interest me. Neither does the nuclear family (except my own, of course). Nor does motherhood. However, I do like apple pie (but I can't cook).
Employer: Well, then, let's see. The explanation of this schedule is that you must love law school and hunger to feast on every course it has to offer you, no matter how unrelated to your job interests.
Ms. D: No, actually I hate law school, too.
Employer: I'm sorry, but we can't hire you.
Ms. D: I'm sure there must be a violation of the National Labor Relations Act in here somewhere---(but I wouldn't know, since I dropped labor law...).
EXCITING MOMENTS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW

...AND SO... WE SEE THAT...
TWO MAYORS... DO NOT...
A CITY MAKE.

Hey, I think he's coming to the end of his sentence.

Huh? Oh well, what did you wake me up for? If only means that we have five straight minutes of total silence.

Yea, but let's think of something to do. You know that I don't especially enjoy looking at the top of Sandalow's head.

(Oh, Jesus) Hey, wait a minute. I've just thought of a rather catchy tune.

Good. Go up there and lead the class in song, Dave. Here, take my cane.

OK, class! Everyone up from their seats! While Mr. Sandalow ponders his next sentence, let us join in song. Just follow me.

Hey, who is this guy? He's not the professor.

Hey, what's going on here?
It goes to the tune of "Candyman," and ah, one, and ah two, and ah three...

When you want a good time full of life and fun because you've been down with your troubles and blues.

Take the Sandalow, the Sandalow, take the Sandalow man.

The Sandalow man 'cause he puts the class to sleep and makes the world so still.

Not bad class. But I believe I heard some rumblings behind me. Mr. Sandalow has probably formulated his next sentence. We'll have to cut it short.

Hey, that was a pretty good song, Dave.

Yea, but I didn't have enough time. We'll try it again a little later, thanks for your cane, Ed.

Oh, don't mention it.
Three of four of your professors expressed disappointment with your performance on the exams. (The fourth was so shocked at your performance that he lapsed into a speechless coma.) The following study guidelines have been drafted for your benefit. IGNORE THEM AT YOUR PERIL!

1. For each case in the casebook, draft all complaints, demurrers, counterclaims, and any other pleadings mentioned. You cannot expect to understand the rules of law if you do not have a solid understanding of what the case is all about.

2. Learn shorthand and how to take dictation. Copy all class discussion and lectures word for word. Prepare complete transcripts of some. What happens in class is vitally important to your education. Too many of you are not keeping permanent complete written records of classroom proceedings.

3. Read the cases in the casebook backwards. Anyone can read a case forwards and understand it. But for a prospective attorney, this is not enough. He/she must know the case backwards and forwards. Reading backwards will be a true test of your understanding.

4. Tape record all class discussion and play it while you are asleep. Why waste 8 hours of the day sleeping? Make more productive use of your time and allow the wisdom of your professors to invade your brain at night. It's just like learning a foreign language while you sleep. Wake up in the morning and speak legalese. Better than that, why not...

5. Study while you sleep. Researchers have proven that you can sleep with your eyes open. Take a few "downs" and just before you nod out, prop your eyes open with a couple of wooden matches. Hold the casebook at normal reading distance and get a friend to turn the pages.

6. Read all of Am. Jur. 2nd. Alternatively, read all of V.J.S. then read all of the cases footnoted. Shepardize them. No one ever said that studying law was easy or quick. Any student who balks at this is either incapable or lazy.

7. Memorize Black's Law Dictionary. To understand the law, you must understand the terms used. The ability to recite the exact 500 word definition of res ipsa loquitur or animus furandi will mark the good law student from the poor one.

8. Bug your professors. That is, wiretap their phones, and electronically eavesdrop on their homes, offices, and autos. Law professors are the fountain of all knowledge of the law. Catch whatever pearls of wisdom they may drop at the breakfast table or on the toilet.

9. Wear 3 piece suits. Everybody, everywhere. You cannot expect to be able to think like a lawyer unless you feel like a lawyer. Three piece suits are an essential characteristics of being a lawyer. The more expensive the suit, the more you'll think like a lawyer.

10. Write your next exams in blood. This, above all, will prove your sincere desire to suffer.

Crusader Rabbit
One Day in Hutchins Hall...

TAX ... ECONOMIC RELATIONS
LAW ... LAND FINANCE ...
YECCH!

MONEY! MONEY! MONEY!
THAT'S ALL WE EVER HEAR
ABOUT IN LAW SCHOOL!
ISN'T THERE MORE TO LIFE?

THERE CERTAINLY IS!
WHew! THAT'S A RELIEF.

THERE'S ALSO
POWER AND PRESTIGE!
PETTY POETRY

From the pen of "Per" Stirpes

(Today's doggerel is dedicated to Doug Kahn, who, though demanding, is decidedly one of the best profs here.)

Tw'as the night before tax class,
    Alone in my room,
I pored over the tax laws,
    They filled me with gloom.
I read casebook and code book,
    It did me no good
If I work in the kitchen
    Can I then deduct food?
"Oh why doesn't the Congress
    Amend tax laws?" I cry
"Repeal alternate tax rates,
    Forget T.P.I."
My seat in the tax class
    Is way in the back
Among all the "chickens"
    Away from the flack.
We love it when Doug E.
    Regales us with lore
Of his days in the "service",
    His clients of yore.
But we dread being called on,
    Don't know what to say,
Please say more about policy
    We all fervently pray.
I won't say he talks quickly
    (Just surmise what you will--
In one lesson I use up
    Two pens and one quill.)
And, man, all those problems
    Assigned for each day,
Just see Sum and Substance
    For answers you say?
Sometimes just one sentence
    In twelve pages (fine print)
Tucked away in the Regs book
    Is the only known hint.
At least fourteen people
    Had passed on that one
When my name was called--
    My big chance had come!
I thought that my answer was right,
    So you know
What a shock when Big Doug E.
    Delivered the blow:
"What about 1.167(j)-2(a)(1)(i)?"
"Sorry, I missed that," I said with a sigh.
I then turned beet-red,
    Kind of squirmed in my seat,

While Doug E. proceeded
    His speed record to beat;
In just under five minutes
    20 answers were said,
Only parts (a) and (b)--
    (On the rest, you just add!)
So beware all ye freshpersons,
    You can take it from me,
If you take tax with Kahn,
    Shorthand's quite necessary.

A Day In The Life...

It is said that every great man devotes a certain portion of his existence to the task of coming to grips with the dynamics of his world, redefining his perspective. Immanuel Kant accomplished this in the course of his brisk early-morning constitutional; Moses put things together by retreating to the Mountain; Buddha discovered life's workings while ruminating beneath a shade tree; and Huxley restructured his orientation during his excursions into the wonderful world of chemicals.

It occurred to me, while contemplating the universe from the porcelain throne in Fraser's Pub, that I, too, as a brilliant legal eagle at the Harvard of the Midwest, must be a Great Man... worthy of an all-encompassing world view all my own. Thus, as my dinner and I exchanged final parting remarks, were my discordant thoughts on the law school (i.e. life) finally crystallized.

Suddenly waxing philosophic, I decided to begin my thesis with a review of the events of that fateful Thursday: this would enable me to evaluate law students through my experiences in class; human nature from my hours in the game room; scholarship in action from the Goulden lecture; and the darker aspect of things from the sanctum sanctorum of Fraser's.

Criminal law: Kamisar is grilling an aspiring superstar on the legal and ethical ramifications ("You mean they aren't coextensive?") of necessity

"Day" cont. on p. 25
killings. The best way to describe this ace is to regurgitate his descriptions: excess sailors in a sinking lifeboat are "definitively supernumerary" (the same lofty phrase I'd seen in the hornbook); to eat the flesh of a fellow miner trapped by a cave-in "elicits compunctions of a nature antithetical to notions of self-preservation" (not to mention a sodomy rap); and there should be no homicide defense in the case of "an adult hebetudinous cretin."

Feeling a healthy dose of remorse for being whatever adjective had so aptly capsulized my fellow cretin, I plodded off to the bowels of the Lawyers Club: the game room.

Specifically, I took my number and waited my turn to engage in that contest so like Natural Selection: foosball. For those of you who have not yet put your pride on the line in this Sport of Kings (pronounce "kinges"), I'll only say that it's more addictive than heroin, more frustrating than an intra-law school date, and more exciting than even a fee tail.

Even as I awaited my turn to play, the pervasive mentality haunted me: unintended foosball foulups were "egregious"; uncollected bonus points on the pinball machine were "inchoate gratuities"; and ping-pong players who delayed before serving were reprimanded for their "inordinately protracted retention" (which I had naively thought to be a Freudian euphemism for holding back one's pooh too long).

Well, Napoleon had his Waterloo and Mama Cass her ham sandwich, so I felt only half-emasculated when I lost my game at the magic table. I'd been momentarily bothered when called a cagey asshole by one of my esteemed opponents (a Law Review man, no less), until I saw that he was only giving me shorthand for "cavernous hemorrhoid suppository recepticle wherefrom fecund matter and/or lucky goalie shots are periodically excreted" - school had at least taught me to rationalize.

At 4:30 I stopped at the lounge to hear the author of Superlawyers fame ... only to witness the emcee calling him a man of "perspicacious insight". Golly, thought I, whatever that means, it must be neat to have your insight characterized by so many syllables... As polished as his golden apples, this guy was clearly a good bet for the Review unless first nailed for analingus. Realizing that destiny had no berth for me in those Olympian strata, I humbly adjourned to the more welcome arms of Fraser's. Here, as before, decidedly lackluster insight was to find short shrift.

I guess it all came down on me when I saw that all the other fellas from law school ranged between "conspiciously inebriated" and "spifflicated/Bacchanalian"; for all my efforts, I wound up "shithased." Sadly, I recalled that Charly Brown once ended up with a rock in his Christmas stocking - but this knowledge availed me very little. All of which led me, perhaps appropriately, to the Men’s Room, wherein I conceived this scatological analysis of the legal mind. By now psychologically and physically depleted - this latter depletion being the high point of my day - I quietly accepted the sentence of cruel fate, never to philosophize like Rod McKuen, never to write like Bennet Cerf, never to be (sigh) perspicacious. With the release of the flush handle, I sadly watched the substance of my dreams spiral into oblivion.

Bob Bride
Last week's winner was John Hugger. He was 18-12 for the week, a percentage of .600. Tied for last were James Hammacher, Steve Olsen, and Stewart Olson. The overall percentage was .457. John can pick up his prize at B-15 of the Lawyers Club, or wherever he sees me. Here we go again.

FRIDAY:
Pepperdine(17½) at Nevada Las Vegas

SATURDAY:
Alabama(4½) at Tennessee
Auburn at Florida(1½)
Boston College(7½) at Fordham
George Washington(20½) at Cincinnati
Clemson(12½) at North Carolina
Dayton(17½) at DePaul
St. Peter's(N.J.)(22½) at Detroit
West Virginia(10½) at Duke
South Carolina at Furman(7½)
Holy Cross(7½) at Georgetown
Purdue at Illinois(5½)
Wisconsin(25½) at Indiana
Iowa(5½) at MICHIGAN
Kansas St. at Kansas(3½)
Mississippi(15½) at Kentucky
Temple(6½) v. LaSalle at the Palestra
LSU(10½) at Vanderbilt
Marquette v. Loyola(Chi.)(15½) at the International Amp.
Maryland(1½) at Notre Dame
Minnesota at Michigan St.(3½)
Missouri at Nebraska(1½)
Niagara(7½) at St. Bonaventure
NC State at Virginia(1½)
Northwestern at Ohio St.(3½)
Ohio U.(10½) at Western Michigan
Wake Forest at St. Francis(Lorette)(9½)
Army(25½) at St. John's
Washington St.(12½) at Washington
UCLA at USC(1½)

NAME: _______________________

TIEBREAKER: Pick the winners of this week's two tournaments:
Pennsylvania Classic: Pennsylvania, Penn St., Pitt, and Duqunense:

Madison Square Garden Classic:
Manhattan, Seton Hall, Canisius, Fairfield: _______________________

RG RANKINGS

1. Indiana(5) 1
2. Marquette 2
3. Rutgers 4
4. Washington 8
5. North Carolina 6
6. Nevada Las Vegas(1) 5
7. Tennessee 10
8. Alabama 11
9. Maryland 3
10. Notre Dame 17
11. North Carolina St. 12
12. UCLA 7
13. Princeton NR
14. St. John's 9
15. Missouri 18
16. Cincinnati 16
17. Western Michigan NR
18. Michigan 15
19. Oregon St. 13
20. Arizona NR

OTHERS RECEIVING VOTES: DePaul, Nebraska, Texas El Paso, Kentucky, Virginia Tech (alias VPI).

That's all this week from the BC Bettor

Query: Is law school a tort?