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Because of the grave disappointment on the part of the Law School, and of the Honorable Justice himself, that William H. Rehnquist was unable to preside at the finals of last year's Campbell Competition, he has been invited to return this year, and will grace us with his presence on Tuesday, March 12th.

Last year a substantial number of law students and others whose economic and civil rights are jeopardized by Rehnquist's presence on the Court engaged in "unwelcoming activities", including picketing and leafletting at the entrances of Hutchins' Hall, to protest the threat Rehnquist's political philosophy and judicial actions pose to the Constitutional freedoms supposedly guaranteed to individuals in this country. Since the good Justice missed it last year, it seems only fair that an unwelcome be held this year. There will be a meeting on Monday, March 11th at 7:30 p.m. in 116 HH to finalize plans for this year's unwelcome.

To those who consider protest a matter of poor taste, we can only suggest that trampling the constitutional rights of the people of this country under the aegis of its highest tribunal of justice is a tragi-comedy that far outweighs any consideration of taste, and that the First Amendment to the Constitution was not meant to make life polite and unruffled.

Rehnquist's record provides ample reason for protest. Since his appointment to the Court in 1971, Rehnquist has actively opposed the expansion of constitutional freedoms (see his dissent in Roe v. Wade, the abortion case), and has effectively spearheaded a drive to undercut those constitutional freedoms which formerly were inviolate, most recently in his opinion in Gustafson v. Florida, expanding the police power of reasonable search to arrests for simple traffic offenses, and allowing any evidence of any crime obtained as a result of that search to be admissible in court.

William Rehnquist graduated Phi Beta Kappa from Stanford University and graduated first in his class from Stanford Law School in 1952. As Nixon stated in his speech nominating Rehnquist to the Supreme Court, he was then "awarded one of the highest honors a law graduate can achieve." For those of you who don't know the honor to which he was referring, Rehnquist was appointed law clerk for Justice Robert H. Jackson, one of the more conservative members of the Court at the time. That appointment lasted for 18 months.

Looking for a place to practice law, Rehnquist headed for sunny Arizona. He joined a law firm in 1953 and later formed his own law partnership in 1956. Also about that time, Rehnquist became very active in the ultra conservative wing of the Republican Party of Arizona, which was beginning to rise to power in the state. A lawyer who knew him in Arizona told Martin Waldron of the New York Times (October 28, 1971) that:

Unlike a lot of Arizona politicians who tried to follow the public thought, Rehnquist really is a deep philosophical conservative. He apparently just sat down and thought it out and decided intellectually that he is against anything liberal.

By the end of 1957, Rehnquist had become a major spokesman for the conservative movement in Arizona. On September 19, 1957, Rehnquist made his first major political speech, before (see IN RE next page)
February 27, 1974

To the Editors:

True Facts Department

When representatives from the Law Review and the Journal of Law Reform visited a first year class (section One) a few weeks ago to explain the method of achieving membership in their respective groups by entering a writing competition, they were soundly HISSED AT!!

Draw from this what conclusions you will... in any case the times, they are a-changin!

s/ G. Burgess Allison '76

WHITHER THE PINBALL MACHINES?

Some of the pinball machines have been suffering much more than their normal share of damage within the past few months (e.g. broken glass and legs), and as things are turning out, we have a good chance of losing them all.

If the person who damages a machine does not report it himself or remains unidentified, the money for repair does not come from the Senate - its 50% cut of the machines' revenue remains intact - it comes out of the pocket of the independent, small businessman who owns and does the maintenance work on the machines. If the damage continues at its present rate, this owner, who has been most fair with the school, tells us that he may be forced to remove the machines. And the Senate would naturally be very hesitant in procuring another supplier under such conditions.

- John Guillelan

(IN RE cont'd from page 1)

fore the Maricopa County Young Republican League. In it, he denounced the 'left wing' of the Supreme Court - Warren, Douglas, and Black - stating that they were making "the Constitution say what they wanted it to say." He described Chief Justice Warren as a "fine California politician," but not much of a lawyer. After all, "he was 58th out of 65 in his law school class." (He probably didn't make Campbell competition, either.)

In its December 13, 1957 issue, the US News and World Report interviewed Rehnquist concerning the Supreme Court. He attributed its liberal political philosophy to the "unconscious slanting" of material reaching the Justices by the Court clerks, most of whom were observed to be to the "'left' of both the nation and the Court". Some of these "liberal" points of view of the clerks were: "extreme solicitude for the claims of Communists and other criminal defendants, expansion of Federal power at the expense of State power, and great sympathy toward any government regulation of business."

Throughout the 1960's Rehnquist continued to practice law in Arizona, and also continued to remain active in the Republican Party. In 1964, Rehnquist came to public attention for his

( cont'd next page )
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outspoken opposition to a public accommodations law pending before the Phoenix city council. The law would have made it illegal to discriminate in public accommodations on the basis of race, a law very similar to federal legislation soon passed with overwhelming support. In his statement to the City Council, Rehnquist said:

The ordinance summarily does away with the historic rights of the owner of the drugstore, lunchcounter or theater to choose his own customers. By a wave of the legislative hand, hitherto-private businesses are made public facilities, which are open to all persons regardless of the owner's wishes... It is, I believe, impossible to justify the sacrifice of even a portion of our historic individual freedom for a purpose such as this."

In 1967, Rehnquist once again came to public attention with his opposition to a voluntary "Integration plan" proposed by the superintendent of the Phoenix Schools. The changes proposed were minor, and were (primarily) in response to public opinion against segregated schools. The issue had been brought to the forefront by a carefully researched article in the Arizona Republic, exposing the extent of the segregation, the detrimental effects on the minority student population, and outlining possible remedies. Surveys showed that children with Spanish surnames averaged only about 6 years of education, while Blacks and Indians averaged 30% less education than whites. In addition, achievement levels in the white schools were much higher than in the other Phoenix schools.

To remedy this situation, the school superintendent proposed voluntary desegregation with students paying their own transportation costs, and educational exchanges between schools - actions much like those HEW officials and federal judges had considered meaningless "tokenism" in Southern school districts. Even these proposals, however, were too much for Rehnquist. In a letter to the Republic, he wrote:

We are no more dedicated to an "integrated" society than we are to a "segregated" society; we are instead dedicated to a free society, in which each man is accorded a maximum amount of freedom of choice in his individual activities. Those who would abandon it [the neighborhood school concept] concern themselves not with the great majority for whom they claim it has not worked well. They assert a claim for special privileges for this minority, the members of which in many cases may not even want the privileges the social theorists urge to be extended to them.

During the time Rehnquist was active in the Republican Party, he became friends with Barry Goldwater and Richard Kleindienst, who had been state Republican Party Leader, and national field director for both Goldwater's presidential campaign in 1964, and Nixon's in 1968. Consequently, when Kleindienst was appointed Deputy Attorney General in the Nixon administration in 1969, he brought along Rehnquist to Washington. Rehnquist was appointed Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Office of Legal Counsel in February, 1969. This Office interprets the Constitution and Federal statutes for the President and the Attorney General, and gives legal advice to all departments of the government.

In his tenure as Assistant Attorney General, Rehnquist was often the Administration spokesman on police surveillance and other issues of criminal law. Rehnquist, for example, defended the constitutionality of the President's waging war in Indochina, including the 1970 incursion into Cambodia, the President's orders barring disclosure of many government documents, and the mass arrests of peaceful demonstrators by Washington police. He also strongly supported the Nixon law-and-order package, including 'no-knock' entries. Pre-
trial detention, wiretapping, and electronic surveillance, often stating that the Supreme Court had gone too far in protecting the rights of the accused.

Rehnquist's especially strong defense of wiretapping and other government surveillance is a matter of public record. His bold assertions of almost unlimited executive prerogatives in these areas are in striking contrast to his reluctance to employ governmental power against discrimination. For example, in March, 1971, Rehnquist told the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights that he vigorously opposed any legislation which would restrict the government's ability to gather information about American citizens. He stated that government "self-discipline" was the answer to all the complaints against the abuses of governmental information gathering. He told Senator Sam Ervin, Jr., the chairman of the committee, that although it would be "inappropriate" and a "waste of taxpayer's money," it would not violate the senator's rights for the government to put him under surveillance.

Rehnquist reiterated this theme a short time later, on March 15, 1971, before the Maricopa County, Arizona, Bar Association:

Occasionally some law enforcement official is going to follow the wrong man, but it would be a mistake to regard the error as a violation of a man's civil rights...The critics of government lack consistency...The critics blasted the Secret Service because they didn't stop Oswald from planning and committing President Kennedy's murder. They wanted to know why it wasn't prevented. When the army was naive enough to pursue this line of thinking and began preventative investigation, it came under attack."

Rehnquist was also a primary Administration spokesman for denouncing anti-war demonstrators. For example, in a New York Times article of May 2, 1969, Rehnquist was quoted as saying:

I suggest to you that this attack of the new barbarians constitutes a threat to the notion of government of law which is every bit as serious as the 'crime wave' in our cities...the barbarians of the New Left have taken full advantage of their minority right to urge and advocate their views as to what substantive changes should be made in the laws and policies of this country.

In a later speech in North Carolina on May 5, 1970, Rehnquist defended mass May Day arrests, where hundreds of innocent bystanders were arrested and held without charges, as an application of "qualified martial law."

On October 21, 1971, Rehnquist, along with Lewis Powell, Jr., were nominated as Associate Justices of the Supreme Court. In his nominating speech, Nixon stated that he was following his pledge to appoint judicial conservatives who would "strengthen the peace forces as against the criminal forces in our society."

The Senate Judiciary Committee heard testimony November 3 and 4, 1971, concerning its recommendations for confirmation or rejection. Of major concern was Rehnquist's civil rights and civil liberties record. Little opportunity was gained, however, to question Rehnquist on the questions of strong police practices. He alternatively asserted an attorney-client privilege was based on the shaky legalism that he was the lawyer for the Attorney General and the President in his role of head of the Office of Legal Counsel. This privilege normally encompasses only confidential material, not personal views of the attorney on issues, but Rehnquist asserted it throughout the hearing.

When Rehnquist's civil rights record...
was examined, the claim was made that he had obstructed voters in the poor and Black districts of Phoenix in various elections in the early 1960's. He denied that he had done so, although he did act as legal counsel for "challengers" appointed by the Republican Party. (Each party in Arizona appoints "challengers" to make sure all persons voting are qualified to do so.) The claim was that as a challenger Rehnquist had intimidated unsophisticated, qualified voters into not voting, concentrating in poor and Black areas of Phoenix. However, no direct witnesses were willing to testify to this.

Rehnquist recanted his opposition to the public accommodations law before the Committee because it has been "widely accepted." In addition, he said he had been wrong to place the freedom of businessmen to exclude customers above the "strong concern the minorities have" about equal access to public places. He did continue to oppose the busing of school children to achieve racial balance.

On November 23, 1971, the Committee approved his nomination by a vote of twelve to four. On December 10, 1971, the Senate voted 68 to 26 in favor of confirming the nomination.

Rehnquist's decisions since coming to the Court have done justice to his political record, if to no other cause, and weigh most heavily on oppressed people and minorities, though there is "something for everyone" in the restriction of constitutional freedoms department. A few examples:

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AND CIVIL RIGHTS
Moose Lodge v. Irvis 407 U.S. 163, 32 L. Ed. 2d 627, 92 S. Ct. 1965. Decision, in an opinion by Rehnquist, that state's action in regulating and licensing private club's sale of liquor was insufficient state connection to warrant award of injunction prohibiting racial discrimination to Negro guest served by club. (Comment: In a more recent Supreme Court case, the state's connection in regulating liquor licenses was held sufficient to warrant interfering with "offensive" sex shows.)
Keyes v. School Dist. #1, Denver, Colorado, 93 S. Ct. 2686, Opinion of the Court by Brennan ordered desegregation of all Denver schools unless the school board could meet a heavy burden of proof that the suburban schools were not intentionally segregated. Rehnquist dissented on the grounds that even if the suburban schools were unlawfully segregated, that would not require integration of the entire area. (Note: this case is considered an important indicator for such cases as the Detroit school bussing case. No one expects Rehnquist to vote in favor of cross district bussing. The Detroit case was argued this Wednesday.)
San Antonio Consolidated School Dist. v. Rodriguez, Rehnquist joined the 5-4 majority in holding that Texas' property-tax based school funding system did not violate equal protection despite the fact that the ultimate result of such funding was to provide poor (mostly Chicano) children with inferior schools, and retreating from the notion underlying Brown and all school desegregation cases that every child has a fundamental right to an equal education.

SEX DISCRIMINATION
Frontiero v. Richardson, 411 U.S. 677, 93 S. Ct. 1764, 36 LEd2d 583, The Court held that a regulation requiring servicewomen to prove their spouses' dependency in order to get fringe benefits for them, while not requiring such proof from servicemen, was a violation of the equal protection clause. (Justice Brennan, Douglas, Marshall, and White would make sex a suspect classification, Stewart and the other three Nixon justices found "invidious discrimination"). Rehnquist dissented on the grounds that since the husband is the traditional breadwinner and the wife "dependent", the economy to the government of the rule outweighed any discriminatory effects it might have.
Cleveland Board of Education v. LaFleur, 42 U.S.L.W. 4186, The Court struck down mandatory maternity leaves for pregnant public school teachers starting in the 4th month of pregnancy as a violation of due process. Rehnquist dissented, finding a 4-month arbitrary cut-off to be reasonable.

RIGHTS OF DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL TRIALS
It is in this area that the Nixon Court has been most repressive. The decisions, mostly 5-4 decisions by the four Nixon justices and Justice White, seem to indicate a repudiation of all the protections struggled for and won under the Warren Court. The most recent of a growing list of decisions in-
clude:

_Gelbard v. United States_ 408 U.S. 41, 33 L.Ed. 2d 179, 92 S.Ct. 235. Federal statute held to justify witness' refusal to answer questions before grand jury, where questions were allegedly based on illegally intercepted conversations. Rehnquist dissented, and his dissent was signed by Burger, Blackmun, and Powell.

This term, Rehnquist's dissent in Gelbard became the basis for the decision of the Court, in which Rehnquist joined, in _U.S. v. Collanda_, 42 U.S.L.W. 4104, which held that the exclusionary rule does not apply to evidence presented to a Grand Jury, and that evidence unlawfully seized may be used as a basis for the questioning of Grand Jury witnesses.

_U.S. v. Robinson_ and _Gustafson v. Florida_ decided the same day, 12/11/73, 42 U.S.L.W. 4055, and just before Collanda, were written by Rehnquist himself, allowing searches after arrests for traffic violations. "Full search incident to lawful arrest requires no justification beyond the fact of the arrest itself." The Terry v. Ohio rule, allowing search only to the extent of making sure the suspect is not armed, and excluding at trial all evidence not related to or obtained in such a search, was distinguished, possibly into oblivion, and limited to its facts.

FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS


_Laird v. Tatum_ 408 U.S. 1, 33 L.Ed. 2d 154, 92 S.Ct. 2318. Decision by White and the Nixon Four: Allegations in federal court action of chilling effect on 1st Amendment rights of Army's system for surveillance of citizens, held not to present justiciable controversy.

- Alison Steiner for the U of M Lawyers Guild Steering Committee (Research and compilation of Rehnquist's record by George Burgott and David Neuman. Updated by John Minock and Alison Steiner)
right amount of materials to satisfy the hordes.

While the Lawyers Guild sometimes wonders why the burden of arranging such practical educational presentations falls upon our too-few shoulders (particularly in a year that's seen a 24% tuition hike), we do take great pride in bringing some truly fine criminal attorneys to share their knowledge and experiences with us. Please try to join us.

- Jim Jenkins
for the Steering Committee
U of M National Lawyers Guild

"COULD YOU REPEAT THAT, I DON'T BELIEVE WHAT I THOUGHT I HEARD YOU JUST SAY," DEPT.

The following letter, dredged up through the unrelenting efforts of RG's extensive network of spies at America's institutions of legal education, is presented as a public service for students still confused about their place in the hierarchy among primates. (Emphasis added to original).

Detroit College of Law
136 East Elizabeth Street
Detroit, Michigan 48201

John S. Abbott
Dean

Mr. Alton T. Davis
853 Federal Building
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Dear Mr. Davis:

Earlier this semester, you, as Chairman of the Faculty-Student Committee of the Student Senate, consulted with me with reference to a proposed Student Course Evaluation Project. This project contemplated student evaluation of both the course and the instructor, with publication of the results to the administration, the faculty, and the student body.

The administration of Detroit College of Law does not approve of nor will it participate in such a project. This administrative decision results from careful and considerable deliberation. The chief factor of this decision is that the rights and duties of the students in this matter are inconsistent with the rights and duties of the faculty. The students' rights are based on freedom of expression. The faculty's rights are based on academic freedom. The administration has determined that the proposed assertion of the students' rights has no useful purpose or demonstrated benefit with reference to publication of the results to the student body. Conversely, published anonymous comments of an instructor's conduct and competence in a classroom setting is a clear and overt invitation to a violation of the rights of the faculty. The resources and facilities of Detroit College of Law cannot be used in the furtherance of a project which has no demonstrated benefit and which has such great potential of infringing upon the rights of the faculty.

The students are here for the purpose of acquiring a legal education. The faculty is here for the purpose of assisting the students in this goal. This process is not an adversary proceeding. It is called the educational process.

This does not foreclose the possibility of a student evaluation project wherein the results would be confidential and furnished only to the administration of Detroit College of Law. In my opinion, this is the only proper utilization of such a student evaluating project. Although this might present some logistical and procedural problems, I would be glad to discuss this matter further with you in the event you would wish to expend your efforts without publishing the end-product to the student body.

In closing, let me restate that this office has been, is, and will continue to be open to any student who has a grievance with reference to the staff, faculty, or administration.

Sincerely yours,

s/ John S. Abbott

WORK STUDY INFORMATION FOR THE 1974 SUMMER TERM

Application forms for the 1974 Summer Term Work Study Program are now available in the Financial Aids Office, Room 307 Hutchins Hall. The deadline for completed Work

(cont'd next page)
Study applications for the Summer Term will be March 8, 1974. All required paperwork must be completed and returned to the Financial Aids Office by this date. Do NOT return the forms to the Work Study Office in SAB.

Due to the volume of applications and the limited availability of government funds for the Work Study Program, no more work Study applications for law students will be accepted for the 1974 Summer Term 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.

* John A. Mason

The Commercial Law League of America is pleased to present

A SYMPOSIUM ON THE PRACTICE OF COMMERCIAL LAW

THURSDAY, March 14, 1974 School of Law 3:30 p.m. University of Michigan Room 100 Hutchins Hall

This panel program will feature presentations by four members of the Commercial Law League who come from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Amarillo, Texas, Mt. Vernon, New York, and Woodbridge, Connecticut. In addition, Stuart E. Hertzberg of Detroit, Michigan, President of the Commercial Law League, will be the panel moderator. They have diversified experience in the field of commercial law, and each will acquaint you with a different aspect of commercial practice.

The panelists will answer many questions for you, such as:

What is commercial practice? How broad are its attractions and career opportunities? What is the relationship of commercial practice to other areas of law? What is the customary procedure for handling commercial matters? What is the Commercial Law League, and why are we interested in speaking to you?

An informal coffee hour will follow the program. The panelists will present you will practical information and a candid appraisal of commercial law which should be of value to all law students. This program has been received with enthusiasm by law students at the Schools of Law of the University of Missouri at Kansas City, Emory University, University of Georgia, Tulane University, University of Texas, Duke University and the University of South Carolina, University of Illinois and Marquette University.

- Nancy Krieger

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE APPLICATION PROCEDURE FOR THE 1974-75 SCHOOL YEAR

The applications for financial assistance for the 1974-75 school year, including the Summer Term (1974), as well as the Fall Term (1974), and the Winter Term (1975), will be available March 1, 1974 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 for the 1974-75 academic year submitted prior to April 1, 1974.

The application procedure for financial assistance for the 1974-75 school year (Summer, Fall, and Winter Terms) is as stated below:

(1) All students who feel that they will need assistance must complete a 1974-75 Law School financial aid application, regardless of previous financial aid status. These applications will be available March 1st in 307 Hutchins Hall. Please read Part 1 (the information section) of the application very carefully.

(2) All students must complete the 1974-75 Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Service Form (GAPFFS). The Applicants and Parents section for this questionnaire must be completed and submitted directly to the Graduate and Professional School Financial Aid Service, Box 2641, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. This form can be picked up at the Financial Aids Office.

(3) Applicants who are applying for assistance for the first time or those who have assistance and feel that they will have

(cont'd next page)
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 Aid Office can supply information on some of these programs.

Because of the number of students applying for these loans, it is necessary that you apply at the earliest possible time. Please make sure that all applications are complete and all necessary forms are submitted with your application. Also, 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 1974 Summer Term and applicants for the 1974-75 Fall and Winter Terms should receive notification by the first week in August.

- John A. Mason

ABA STUDY GROUP URGES CONGRESS TO ACT ON CON-CON PROCEDURES

The American Bar Association is urging Congress to establish procedures for amending the U.S. Constitution through a national constitutional convention. "If we fail to deal now with the uncertainties of the convention method, we would be courting a constitutional crisis of grave proportions," said a report issued by an ABA Special Constitutional Study Committee. In a 102-page booklet reporting on its exhaustive two-year study, the nine-member ABA committee of constitutional experts said that there is need for congressional clarification of the convention issue because questions have been raised repeatedly which are not answered by the Constitution.

The Senate has passed a bill, authored by Sen. Sam Ervin (D-S.C.), to set guidelines for a convention, but the ABA would like to have the House Judiciary Committee -- which has the bill under study -- make several significant changes. The ABA committee notes that, up to now, all constitutional amendments have been proposed by Congress, although the Constitution provides that amendments also can be proposed by a national constitutional convention.

The issue nearly came to a head in 1967 when only two more states were needed to call a constitutional convention on the question of state legislative apportionment. The four-year-old drive had resulted in 32 states adopting applications. A two-thirds majority--34--is required. Debate waxed furiously, in and out of Congress, on what would happen if the required two additional states joined in the call, the report said. The controversy swirled around whether Congress would actually have to call a convention, whether applications from malapportioned legislatures would be counted, whether the subject matter would be restricted to what was included in the states' petition, and the role of the Executive Branch. The two-thirds figure was not reached, however, and the subject cooled, only to flare again over school busing.

To help settle the convention issue, the council of the ABA Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities recommended establishment of a special study committee. The committee, headed by Judge C. Clyde Atkins, U.S. District Court, Miami, Fla., presented its findings to the ABA House of Delegates at the Association's annual meeting last August. The delegates endorsed the committee's conclusions urging congressional action. The committee report maintained that Congress has the power to establish procedures limiting a convention to the subject matter outlined in applications received from state legislatures. It added that any congressional legislation dealing with the convention process should provide for limited judicial review of congressional determinations. Delegates to a convention should be elected, and representation at the convention should conform with the principles of the "one person - one vote" decisions of the Supreme Court, the report said.

Major differences in the ABA recommendations and the Ervin bill are:
(1) ABA wants inclusion of judicial review, saying it would be "very unwise" to follow the Senate bill which "attempts to exclude the courts from any role." ABA said that a three-judge panel from the U.S. district

(cont'd next page)
BASKETBALL POLL

By the time everyone returns from vacation, the regular season will have ended and the first round games of the NCAA tournament will have been played. Only sixteen teams will have a shot at the national championship. Out of the top five teams in the nation, it is possible that none will still be in the running. The ACC has a playoff to determine its representative. Everyone assumes that either Carolina, Maryland, or N.C. State will be the winner, but it conceivably could be Clemson, or even Duke. Notre Dame might lose in the first round. And UCLA may be unseated as champion of the PAC-8 by Southern Cal. So while you're soaking up the sun and doing your EO paper, don't forget to keep in touch with what is happening in the world. It could surprise you.

Mike Wicks won a case of indigestion by virtue of guessing 18 out of 25 correctly for a percentage of .720. The other participants racked up a percentage of .554.

Cross out losers. Put name on paper. Place in a box in front of room 100 by 5:00 p.m. Friday. Have a good vacation.

Alabama at Florida(15 1/2)
Arizona at Arizona St.(8 1/2)
Marquette at Cincinnati(8 1/2)
Pennsylvania at Cornell(15 1/2)
Duke (15 1/2) at North Carolina
Memphis St.(3 1/2) at Hawaii
Houston(10 1/2) at South Carolina
Indiana at Ohio State(15 1/2)
Northwestern(5 1/2) at Iowa
Illinois(15 1/2) at Purdue
Nebraska(10 1/2) at Kansas St.
Kansas at Colorado (10 1/2)
Kentucky(8 1/2) at Vanderbilt
Louisville at Bradley(8 1/2)
Virginia(15 1/2) at Maryland
Wisconsin(6 1/2) at Michigan State
Minnesota(8 1/2) at Michigan
UTEP(4 1/2) at New Mexico
N.C. State at Wake Forest(15 1/2)
Villanova(20 1/2) at Notre Dame
Washington(10 1/2) at Oregon
Pittsburgh at West Virginia(10 1/2)
St. John's(8 1/2) at Providence
Southern Cal at California(10 1/2)
UCLA at Stanford(15 1/2)

Tie-breaker: UCLA plays at Southern Cal on March 9. Who will win and by how many points?

TEAM_________ POINTS_________