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SPECIAL ELECTION ISSUE -- SEE PAGE 8 FOR CAMPAIGN STATEMENTS

THE LAW SCHOOL WEEKLY
APRIL 1, 1974
RES GESTAE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

WHAT'S GOING ON AT OTHER LAW SCHOOLS

From the Virginia Law Weekly, March 8, 1974, we learn from Sam D. Turner that the ostensibly "reform" Multistate Bar Exam has gotten mixed reviews from those who took it in Virginia in February. The Multistate questions are "like the LSAT but tricky as the devil," according to one student who faced the 200 multiple choice queries instead of a second day of 20 essays. Other test-takers noted their retrospective dislike for the Multistate, one observing that "the Multistate probably requires more work, and two different skills are involved in the two different tests. You have to switch gears for the Multistate." In conjunction with Mr. Turner's story, the Weekly editorially characterized the new entry test as the "Multi-Doubt Bar Exam," and the "guessing game to end all guessing games." While believing that the Multistate's ease of grading and provision of "relief to bar examiners swamped with paperwork" insured the exam's continued use, the editorial writer suggested what would be the ultimate referendum on the matter: "Give law professors, state bar examiners and practicing attorneys the six-hour 200-question Multi-Doubt, and reveal their scores to them. The results of that experiment can be predicted, as the examination would soon be folded, spindled and mutilated into oblivion."

De-professionalizing the law was the subject of an article by Edward Lief of the William Mitchell Law School (St. Paul, Minnesota) Opinion dated February, 1974. And the means reviewed was the survey research project undertaken by a group of social scientists last year to aid the defense in choosing a jury at the Wounded Knee trial in St. Paul. The social scientists' role was to design and organize a poll of registered voters, with input on age, sex, educational background, attitude toward authoritarianism, conservative-liberal balance and attitudes toward the trial, and then counsel attorneys during voir dire (see OTHER page 2)

A major fallacy of rehabilitation programs for prisoners is the belief that psychological change can be coerced, a leading criminologist said March 19th at The University of Michigan's Thomas M. Cooley lecture series. In reality, said Norval Morris, prisoners who are forced to participate in psychotherapy and other treatment programs receive little benefit from them. And this is especially true, he said, if inmates "show the facade" of being rehabilitated in order to gain an early release from prison. "In psychological medicine, it is widely agreed that conventional psychotherapy...must be voluntarily entered into by the patient if it is to be effective," Morris noted. "The concept of coerced cure in the correctional field is a dangerous delusion."

As an alternative, he proposed that "education, vocational training, counseling and group therapy should continue to be provided, but on an entirely voluntary basis. There should be no suggestion that a prisoner's release may be accelerated because of participation in such programs, nor that it might be delayed or postponed because of failure to participate." Morris said the same reasoning applies to various conditioning programs which seek to curb criminal behavior. "For criminal behavior related to addiction to drugs and alcohol, sexual proclivities classed as abnormal, and compulsive gambling, there is widespread experimentation with emetics and electric shocks timed to relate to the undesired behavior," Morris noted. But a key to success in these programs, Morris stressed, is that "release and voluntary treatment cannot be linked." "Such successes as have been achieved in aversive conditioning programs are to be found particularly in situations where the subjects of the treatments are profoundly anxious to change patterns of their lives ---troubled transvestites and homosexuals, (see COOLEY page 3)
To the Editors:

La Raza Law Students at the University of Michigan School of Law are united in their support of the United Farm Workers Union and the boycott of non-UFW lettuce and grapes. We feel this issue is of considerable significance to the 2nd Ward electorate and believe that we are in a unique position to comment on the merits of the two candidates for City Council in this regard.

Both Ms. Kozachenko, the Human Rights Party candidate and Ms. Richman, the Democratic candidate publically support the United Farm Workers and pledge to promote their interests and those of all economically oppressed groups if elected to City Council. In Ms. Kozachenko's case her public statements are well supported by clear cut action. She has been active in picketing local stores which sell non-UFW lettuce and grapes and helped organize a petition drive in the dormitories to continue support of the lettuce boycott. Ms. Richman, on the other hand, has taken no comparable affirmative action to support her public statements. On the contrary, Ms. Richman's personal appetites contradict her public position in support and make her credibility on this issue doubtful.

Thus although both candidates are on record as supporting the UFW, we feel that Ms. Kozachenko's actions confirm her words while Ms. Richman's actions belie her public statements and are politically rather than personally felt.

It is for the above reasons that we endorse Kathy Kozachenko, HRP, to represent the 2nd Ward in the City Council and urge our fellow students to do likewise.

s/ La Raza Law Students
University of Michigan
Law School

---

(OTHER cont'd from page 1)

about "indications of bias, body language and other clues." One of the social scientists, Diane Wiley, asserted that "lawyers don't really know how to pick jurors. They operate on a highly emotional level. If an attorney feels this is a really hot juror, he's probably wrong." She went on to say that the project she participated in was "part of an attempt at de-professionalization of law, a move against elitist structures," in which attorneys and social scientists operate as a collective with no prestige hang-ups. Questioners of the speaker were especially concerned about abuse of the method described, one wondering whether it wasn't a subversion of the jury system. "What's subversive about getting a jury which is fair?" was the reply. "Don't talk to me about subversion on our part. This argument seems to come from liberals unable to come to terms with the fact that the government is unfair, is really raunchy. This baloney about being presumed innocent is totally nonsense." When prosecutor use of survey research was raised as an issue, Ms. Wiley disavowed secrecy tactics. "If the government wants to pick up on it, we'll have to try something else. As it is, the FBI sends infiltrators in to screw up our studies and make trouble. But we're on the up and up."

Phil Spector, on the staff of the Harvard Law Review, took a different view of the Wounded Knee jury project in the February 8, 1974 issue. "Scientific Jury Selection Warps Justice" was the lead and Pandora's Box the metaphor. "The latest application of social science to law has pleased many..."
people in the short run," Mr. Spector wrote, "but it raises new concerns about the long-term viability of the jury trial system," Emphasizing the great time and expense required for such projects, he goes on to note that only "well-publicized radical defendants, who generally have access to a defense fund and many enthusiastic volunteers" get the luxury of a potential juror poll. Mr. Spector believed that notwithstanding his sympathies with the defendants in the several political trials affected by jury research (Harrisbury and Gainesville), there remained "issues of privacy and potential iniquity which I find very disturbing. The potential juror is scrutinized by psychologists and body language specialists; he or she is, in effect, psychoanalyzed while performing a civic duty, a duty, moreover, originally forced upon the person, rather than volunteered for. Then, his or her personal life is checked upon by investigators, a practice that many of us consider an invasion of privacy when done to the unwary by the FBI or a private credit agency...The unfairness now caused when one party has access to better attorneys and more investigative resources would be multiplied many times...Moreover, our feeling that juries somehow mystically 'do justice' would be irreversibly undermined."

The February 12, 1974 issue of the NYU Commentator carried a letter to the editor on one of the great issues of the day: "As a third-year student I have read the Commentator for three years and have seen many controversies rage within its pages...but until this time, no controversy had swept me up, forcing me to, as they say, demand my day in court...During my first year at NYU, a newspaper article noted that only ten law schools in the nation had student bodies with at least 20 percent women, and NYU was on the list. And now the percentage has grown even more. Women occupy high editorial positions on the school journals, and fill the top 20 percent of each class. However, I believe that certain actions on the part of the school have gone just too far. Upon returning from Christmas break I entered Vanderbilt Hall, and when nature beckoned, as she will from time to time, I sauntered up the second floor in search of relief. But as I headed toward the door marked MEN, I noted that it was now marked WOMEN. Thinking that there must be some mistake, and being naturally curious, I looked inside, and immediately realized what had happened. Gone were my beloved urinals and there on the floor was new plush green carpeting. Women in my law class...great. Women as editors of journals...great. Even on the sports teams...great. But not in my bathroom. The school is only 30 percent women so they should only be entitled to 30 percent of the lavatory space. I believe in equality but this is going to far. s/ Distressed.

Just to show that the great issues of the day do not escape the other leading law school newspapers of the country (at least in New York), the Columbia Law School News, February 25, 1974 edition, carried an article by Darrel Paster describing how "amid an apparent exercise of self-help on the part of some Law School women, the administration is finally moving to correct the imbalance in bathroom facilities on the first floor. In a wide ranging ten minute interview, Assistant Dean Peter Swords said that the 6 commodes in the southwest section of the present men's room would be partitioned off, and a new door created connecting them to the present women's rest room. Swords reported that the administration...had decided that utility would best be served by allowing the men to keep the urinals in that room...The action came none to soon as two young coeds...were seen using the soon-to-be-altered men's room last week. In a brief, superficial interview one of 'raiders' admitted that their motivation was not political but biological. She said that she and a 'friend' were standing in line to use a stall in women's room between class periods when they decided it was ridiculous to wait while '20 stalls stood empty less than 10 feel away...The guys handled themselves better than I thought they would,' she said. Apparently the best part was leaving the scene. Our women intruder reported seeing at least two potential cases of whiplash as men did double-takes in the crowded hall."

-Mike Slaughter

(COOLEY cont'd from page 1)

anxious alcoholics, burnt-out drug addicts, and paid-out gamblers."

At the same time, Morris endorsed initial "crisis intervention" programs to compel prisoners to learn of the treatment alter-
natives available to them. "In many parts of the world I have seen the sulky and reluctant participant in a group therapy program, sitting stolid, silent and resentful in the corner, who a few sessions later has been captured by the spirit of the enterprise and is an involved, vocal and apparently appreciative participant. "Crisis intervention to compel people at least to take stock of alternative avenues of self-development is not a debasing of a treatment program. But I strenuously affirm that the prisoner must be given the unfettered opportunity...to decide after a brief compelled observation of a treatment program that he wants no part of it," Morris said. If treatment is not used as a condition for release, Morris said, a more "just and rational" alternative would be to inform the prisoner of the length of his sentence during the early part of his imprisonment. "Either the term imposed must be fixed by the judge," Morris suggested, "or, if the term be indeterminate or indefinite and subject to parole, the parole board must determine the date of release in the first few weeks of the prisoner's incarceration and advise him of that date."

Morris also took issue with proposals to increase prison sentences on the basis of the predicted "dangerousness" of criminals. Saying that accurate prediction is impossible and that such measures could be abused, Morris asserted: "Dangerousness as a selective criterion for the imposition of a prison term is both conceptually weak and politically unwise."

Morris is a law professor and director of the Center for Studies in Criminal Justice at the University of Chicago.

-UM News

MALE THREAT FROM FEMALE COMPETENCE

It has been reliably reported to me that a very large portion of male law students (and professors) appear to be utterly incapable of dealing with the issue of sex discrimination at levels beyond the wisecrack and the snicker. This is something of a puzzle to me, since the reality of any harm from such discrimination have been rather forcefully pointed to during the past few years. Scaled, psychological injuries inflicted on women are not of the same moral importance as genocide or lynching. Buy systematic destruction of the personality potentialities of half the human race ought to be a concern, a very serious concern, of all moral actors generally, and of lawyers in particular.

One facially plausible hypothesis for this inability to treat the sex discrimination problem seriously could be a great fear that if the restrictions were lifted the women would outperform, and thereby humiliate the men (and me in particular). This theory is fed by the common experience of girls outperforming boys in grade-school academics, and, in law school, by the generally higher GPAs and LSAT scores of entering women.

A recent presentation by a Residential College instructor of his PhD research at an Institute for Social Research luncheon colloquium, entitled "Male Threat from Female Competence", seemed a good prospect to test some aspects of the hypothesis, so I put a notice on the bulletin board in front of Room 100 as an invitation to law students. Two came (one male, one female), so I'd like to briefly report the research here in the hope that it might provoke some introspection about psychological avoidance mechanisms.

The title of the presentation and the dissertation, as is nearly always the case, was far more grandiose than the design or the funding allowed in practice. Using 91 college dating couples (male-female), the investigator used a sentence-completion, emotive test instrument to build a "threat scale" for the males, and then correlated scale scores with various attitudinal and performance measures. The threat scale was built from questions of the form "When Bill found out that Alice got a higher test score than he did, he ________". The performance measures included both academic records and scores obtained on a special verbal facility test given to each couple in both cooperative and competitive settings.

Given the small sample size, it is not surprising that only a few of the correlations between threat scale scores and the other measures attained acceptable statistical significance levels. Those that did, however, are of some interest. First, those males who had the highest number of "threatened" responses were by far the most likely subgroup to say that they would prefer not to be placed in a competitive situation with their girl-friend in the future. And (cont'd next page)
second, the high-threat males in competitive situations, and the low-threat males in cooperative situations, obtained significantly higher scores on the verbal facility test than the other subgroups. It seems therefore, that men who are highly threatened by competition form women both dislike it and are spurred by it.

Self-selection of boyfriends and girlfriends also seems to be related to the threat measure. High threat males thought their girlfriends held themselves in much lower self-esteem than those women actually did regard themselves; but those same women tended to have an idealized image of their high-threat boyfriends, and considered themselves more likely to be marrying them than did the women who came with low-threat men. This selection of partners seems not to have been related to self-ratings of competence, striving, or to socioeconomic or academic indicators.

The experiment was poorly designed and therefore inconclusive in some important respects other than sample size. First, the scale was based on abstract third parties, but the verbal facility test was with a dating partner. It may well be that the sense of male threat is very different within a dating relationship than in other settings. Second, and more important, no measure was taken of sense of male threat from the competence of other males. It could be that the relationship of sense of threat and attitudes toward competition is not all sex-related. In general self-esteem was very high in this study; that doesn't exclude the possibility that sense of self-esteem in some men is dependent on dominance (or at least non-inferiority), but it does call for more careful study design.

Even without firm psychodynamic conclusions from this research, its implications are strong enough to warrant a bit of self-analysis before the snicker erupts at the next mention of sex discrimination. And certainly before taking that legislative seat.

- Terry Adams

"approves in principle the offering of seminars in which students would be involved in field work or clinical work outside the law school, under faculty supervision, with substantially more credit than has traditionally been given in seminars."

Among the seminars suggested at that time were an internship with the National Labor Relations Board in Detroit, and possibly with the U.A.W. or several of the major labor law firms (proposed by Prof. Harry Edwards), a seminar to engage in the drafting of model state and local legislation dealing with solid waste disposal (proposed by Dean Pierce), the formation of an interdisciplinary "consulting firm" to advise municipalities, regulatory agencies, or other "clients" on environmental problems (proposed by Prof. Joseph Sax), a program in Washington, D.C. to undertake research and investigation of administrative problems (proposed by Prof. Cramton who, of course, is no longer here), a placement with private law firms involving business planning (proposed by Prof. Stanley Siegel), and a placement program with judges, prosecutors, and police officers to study police-court administration and the criminal enforcement structure (proposed by Prof. Joseph Vining).

All of the above seminars would involve some amount of faculty supervision and most would require a paper. In addition, it would appear that under the terms of the resolution other "field placement" seminars might be considered by the faculty as they are proposed.

I am advised that as of this writing, none of the above described seminars has been implemented. Apparently, the main reason for this failure has been the lack of anyone on the

(Cont'd next page)
faculty or in the student body to actively push for implementation. I have been assured by some members of the faculty that a substantial showing of interest by students could probably result in the implementation of at least some "field placement" seminars.

If anyone is interested in pursuing this matter, you are welcome to contact Barry Zaretsky at 662-5428.

FEELING NUCLEAR WASTED?

PILS (Public Interest Law Society) has been asked by the Michigan AG's office to help with some research on the question of the transportation of nuclear wastes. Time required will not be substantial. Some background in constitutional law is probably necessary.

Please contact Alan Barak, 764-8976 if you are interested. Two or three people are needed.

(What is PILS? It is a UM law student organization formed earlier this semester to act as a clearinghouse for public interest groups and appropriate government agencies needing legal help and publicly interested law students. Check the PILS message board in the basement of legal research - next to the men's john - for project information.)

FRESHMAN WRITING COMPETITION

This is a reminder to the Freshman students that there is a Freshman Joint Writing Competition being conducted by the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform and Michigan Law Review. For a list of the topics and for further information please come and talk to us at our respective offices on the seventh floor of the Legal Research Building and the fourth floor of Hutchins Hall.

Note that all students who accept an invitation to join the Law Review will be required to come back to school on August 12th. Those who accept an invitation to join the Journal of Law Reform will be required to return on August 19th.

- Mary Lou Fellows

NOTICE

There will be a meeting on April 9, 1974 at 3:30 p.m. in room 120 HH, for anyone interested in taking Clinical Law this Summer or next Fall.

- Edward B. Goldman

LAW-ECONOMICS TALK SCHEDULED

Gordon Tullock, who is affiliated with Virginia Poly-Tech and State University, and more recently Carnegie Mellon University as a professor, will be speaking in the area of law and litigation. The lecture entitled "Efficiency and Litigation" will be presented this Friday at 3:30 P.M. in Room 101 Economics Bldg.

APPLICATIONS FOR 1974-75 SENIOR JUDGESHIP

For those of you who missed the notice in a recent Res Gestae issue, applications for the position of Senior Judge for 1974-75 can be obtained from Linda Brown in room 318 Hutchins Hall. Applications should be submitted immediately. If you have any questions, please see Dean Borgsdorf.

BASKETBALL POLL

North Carolina State and Larry Joachim won the final basketball poll. Larry correctly predicted the spread in the championship game and came within nine points of forecasting all the spreads perfectly.

If RG had the money, which it doesn't, Lefty Ruschmann and Howie Bernstein would be entitled to an award for their devotion to college basketball. Lefty and Howie motored all the way to Tuscaloosa, Alabama to see the Notre Dame-Michigan encounter. Since Lefty is a Notre Dame alumnus his motivation is easily understood. However, Howie is not a strong Michigan fan, and furthermore, he hates Notre Dame. Apparently, he just loves basketball. So congratulations are in order for North Carolina State, Larry Joachim, Lefty Ruschmann, and Howie Bernstein.

Coming: A new poll.

- George A. Pagano
LAW REVIEW EDITORS CHOSEN FOR 1974-5

Editor-in-Chief
Mark F. Pomerantz

Managing Editor--Projects
Erica A. Ward

Managing Editor--Notes
Mary Lou Fellows

Executive Editors
Dale A. Oesterle
John C. Reitz
John C. Roebuck

Note Editors
Susan Low Bloch
Barbara E. Etkind
Susan G. Faller
Mark D. Herlach
Abigail S. Kelly
Joel E. Krischer
James L. Wamsley III

Articles Editors
Clayton P. Gillette
Gerald B. Leedom
Ronald S. Longhofer

Sports & Party Editor
Adrian L. Steel, Jr.

CLINICAL PROGRAM IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

The United States Department of State has invited the Michigan Law School, along with several other leading law schools, to participate in a clinical program in international law that has been instituted in the Department on a limited, experimental basis. The Michigan Law School has approved the participation in this program which was described by the Deputy Legal Adviser in the following terms:

The participating student from the third year law school class "would spend one semester working in a designated branch of the Office. While he would have an opportunity to participate in some of the day-to-day operational work of the Office, his emphasis would be on a selected number of long-range problems of current interest to the Office. He would be expected to do thorough research into these problems and to produce a major written product as a result of his research. This product would be unclassified. This combination of work experience and research-writing would be under the immediate supervision of an Assistant Legal Adviser and under the general supervision of a Deputy Legal Adviser. The Counselor on International Law (currently Prof. Stephen M. Schwebel) would also meet regularly with the student and provide him with supervised reading on subjects in the area to which he is assigned. We would also hope to organize a series of seminar-like sessions within the Office of the Legal Adviser, with other officials of the Department, with officers of other Government agencies and with individuals from private life in the Washington area."

The Law School faculty may recommend to the State Department one or two second-year students on the basis of their record and proven interest in the international field for a one-term appointment. The faculty will maintain general supervision over the Michigan participant and a faculty committee will evaluate the major research paper which each participant will be expected to produce. Upon satisfactory completion of the term the participant will receive 12 hours "pass" credits toward graduation.

Students interested in an appointment for the fall term 1974 or winter term 1975 should contact Professor W.W. Bishop, Jr. (971 Legal Research) or Professor Eric Stein (918 Legal Research), the Co-directors of International and Comparative Legal Studies at the Law School.
CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT

JIM HILL

I appreciate this opportunity to express my views as a candidate for President. The Law Senate can truly represent students since it commands respect from both the university and the community. What it needs is vigorous leadership to promote student needs, and I promise to provide that leadership.

Basically, my platform is:
1) A job program inviting smaller law firms to hire students for summer and permanent employment. Currently, only top firms with no jobs for freshmen are invited.
2) I have evidence that the tuition hike was unjustifiably steep even after the refund, and I will work to see that the truth is revealed.
3) Repair and service of pinball and concession machines will improve or we will find a new dealer who promises us better service.
4) Mandatory SGC dues must be abolished.
5) Continue promotion of the movie, mixer, sherry hour, and athletic programs due to increased student interest.
6) Encourage more practical law programs.

My experience as a Law Senator, chairman of the Speakers Committee, and SGC councilman, as well as my knowledge in budgeting and university channels will prove invaluable in the upcoming term, and I urge you to carefully consider who can most effectively promote your interests.

TERRENCE G. LINDEMAN

CANDIDATES FOR TREASURER

BERTIE N. BUTTS '76

As a candidate for the office of treasurer of the LSSS, I have a few points that I feel may interest you.

1) A brief account of each week's Senate meeting published in the Res Gestae. A definite lack of communication currently exists between the Senate and the students.
2) Blue books supplied for all exams to eliminate the hassle of exchange.
3) Senate sponsoring of a book exchange at the beginning of each semester, a simple way to buy or sell used books at a reasonable price.
4) A full four Sherry hours each semester. Let's have a chance for some informal mixing.
5) A return of the pinball machines. This is the main source of funding for the Senate's independent activities.

Background: I graduated from Duke University in 1969 with a B.A. in economics. Before coming to Michigan I spent three years in the Peace Corps in Northeast Brazil working with a rural electric cooperative teaching accounting and management concepts.

I would appreciate your support in the coming election.
DAVID DeGABRIELE

I would like to thank the RG for this opportunity to state my views concerning my candidacy for the position of Treasurer in the LSSS elections. My principal qualifications for the office of treasurer are:
(1) My undergraduate degree is in Accounting and I have worked during four summers in the professional Accounting field.
(2) I am currently an incumbent Law Senator and have served on the Elections, Tuition, and Lawyers Club Rates Committees which has given me an insight into the workings of the Law Senate.

The goals I intend to work for if elected are:
(1) Lower tuition or no tuition hike next year - research has shown that an excess amount of money over the budgeted tuition has occurred this year.
(2) Repair and replacement of broken pinball machines.
(3) More sports equipment made available to all Law Students - female and male.
(4) Better placement services to give realistic job opportunities to all segments of the Law School, including freshmen.
(5) Removal of the Law School from the Student Government Council and refund of fees currently paid by all law students with no return to them.
(6) Any other issues which concern law students - my constituency.

CANDIDATE FOR SECRETARY

BILL HAYS

Some things I would work for if elected:

(1) Dances. Our mixers are oriented toward allowing male law students to meet (pick up, etc.) non-law female students. Because of the resulting meat-market atmosphere, many female and married law students don't attend. I propose that the LSSS sponsor at least one dance a term. By dance, I mean a social occasion where wine is served instead of beer, the music is quiet enough that you can talk to your partner, and the dress is more formal than blue jeans and tennis shoes. I wouldn't want to do this instead of a mixer, but in addition to them. They would be different enough that they wouldn't conflict. I have been told that dances of this type have been less than successful. But success is relative, and I think at least part of the law school community would enjoy a social event of this type.

(2) Intramural Sports. The rules of the graduate division in IM sports allows any graduate student to play on any graduate team. This has led to wholesale recruiting of "ringers" for our Gold and #1 teams. (2/5 of the Law Gold basketball team were non-law students). I believe that any team which uses the law school's name, and has their registration fees paid by our LSSS dues, should be composed only of law students. This policy would in no way prevent law students from forming a super-team if they wish. But we have enough talent here to dominate almost any sport we enter, and I think that in sports, if not in the courtroom, we should play by the ethical rules rather than the loopholes.

CANDIDATES FOR MEMBER-AT-LARGE

JOSEPH J. AYAUB

The job of a Law School Student Senate member is to represent the views and interests of the law student body. It is a representative function and should remain so even after the election. As a candidate for Senate Member-at-Large, I offer you the following specific and realistic proposals:
(1) That Res Gestae and other media be regularly used to inform the student body of Student Senate activities. (2) That the Senate take specific steps to facilitate input from all members of the student body. (3) That all classes be provided with blue books at examination time. (4) That the former level of mixers and sherry hours be restored. (5) That law students be assured adequate study space. (6) That plant facilities be improved by adding more lockers, a second T.V., a pool table, and an adequate means for women to reach the laundry room. (7) That a book exchange be established to enable students to sell used books without inequitable losses.

There are many other worthy suggestions. That's why the most important need of all is to consistently seek out student opinion. I promise to be that kind of representative but I need your help. Vote on Tuesday.
I am a veteran of many campaigns, most recently at Tuscaloosa, and now I am running for Member-at-Large. We ought to remember that each of us is spending three years here, and I will try to make that stay more pleasant. One feasible idea is to get the Lawyers Club a limited liquor license, along the lines of the University Club. This establishment could charge lower prices than nearby bars like the V-Bell. We could also get a sauna put in here. There is enough unused space in the basement of the Club, and the cost would not be prohibitive. There are also better uses for your $15.00 fee than the copy center. Why not have more sherry hours, more mixers? What about parking? There must be someplace closer to the Quad than Michigan Stadium and the Coliseum. One other thing we can do is push for pass-fail grading. Yale has it, and that's not a second rate law school. We can try to do something about non-lawyers in the law library. When you think about your vote, think of what you would like the law school to be. And then think about the Tuscaloosa Ticket, and Howie.

PAUL "LEFTY" RUSCHMANN

Yo!

I'm Paul "Lefty" Ruschmann and if you're reading this, you're probably bored as hell with your class--all the more reason to vote the straight "Tuscaloosa Ticket" on Election Day.

Our platform boils down to this: Be serious only about having a good time. We Tuscaloosa people aren't into saving the world--particularly before 11 am, because it infringes upon rack time--but we can make life here a little less unconscionable:

(a) A Bar without a Grill is like a life without meaning. Therefore, let's get a liquor license for the Law Quad--any Thursday at the V-Bell is proof that the need exists.

(b) Participatory democracy in the Game Room. Let's get the pinball machines we want: why settle for Circus just because Orbit (the game of champions) is occupied?

(c) Find better uses for our $15 dues than printing up Property I notes, which you can neither drink nor smoke.

(d) The lowest passing grade. Let's go pass-fail; it's good enough for Yale, and we aren't even burdened with Erich Segal and Charles Reich.

(e) End of platform. Look for the red "Alabama" shirts of the Tuscaloosa Ticket, and let's roll with the tide!

AL SHARE

Like most of you, I only have vague notions of what the Senate does. However, I do have definite ideas on what it should do.

One current weakness is hinted at above. There is a glaring insufficiency of communication with the student body. Greater communication will undoubtedly lead to greater student input and greater responsiveness to the needs of the individual student.

It is to these needs that the Senate must more diligently address itself. Although the budget allocations to the various student organizations are important and must be worked on carefully, the Senate's efforts must not stop there. It should directly attempt to alleviate the problems of the individual student by working to make law school a more personal and pleasant experience. Whether it be more pinball machines or more varied activities, the Senate must use its efforts to emphasize the social aspect of law school to offset the pressures we all face everyday at Hutchins Hall.

In terms of academics, one suggestion would be to initiate group discussions by older students during the first semester dealing with different approaches to studying and taking finals. This would aid first year students trying to adjust to a different new situation and, again, would be in keeping with the theme of making law school a more enjoyable experience for the individual student.

STEVE WECHSLER

If elected to the LSSS I will attempt to achieve the following goals:

(1) Make the Senate more accessible and responsive to the law school community. The Senate should look for ways to communicate its decisions and activities (in addition to those purely social) to the students and should seek student input on
desired projects. This is particularly important in the area of spending the money collected from students.

(2) **Make the Senate strictly accountable for the funds received from students.** Part of the $15 fee we each pay every term goes to the LSSS. Regular reports should be issued detailing where this money goes and students should have a major voice in budget decisions.

(3) **Eliminate the Xerox Room charge.** Part of the $15 fee is said to go to support the Copy Center to provide students with Xeroxed materials for our courses. In my opinion, this is what we pay tuition for and an additional fee each term is as inappropriate as charging us for a seat in the library. The Senate should work to eliminate this charge.

(4) **Reform the Course Evaluation.** In its present form, with its endless statistical tables, the Course Evaluation summaries are almost worthless; the student comments, which were the most useful feature, were needlessly deleted from the most recent edition. The Senate should devise and administer a functional course evaluation which students could benefit from in deciding what courses to take.

---

**BRUSSELS FELLOWSHIPS FOR 1974-75 STILL OPEN**

Exchange with Brussels Free University, Belgium for 1974-75, commencing October 1: One full fellowship available at the French Law Faculty, for a French-speaking Senior in Law who will graduate prior to October 1, 1974 (sound, working knowledge of the language to University-lecture level);

One full and several partial fellowships available at the Flemish Law Faculty in the Program on International Legal Cooperation, where the lectures-seminars are given in English. Requirements: graduation from Law School prior to October 1, and reading knowledge of French (for certain assigned materials).

Interested students should see Professor Eric Stein (918 Legal Research) or Mrs. Mary B. Gomes (973 Legal Research) as soon as possible; application deadline approximately mid-March 1974. Decisions should be made by late April, 1974.

---

**NEW STRINGS ON LAWYERS**

Iowa now has the toughest client security fund regulations in the nation. Following in the wake of a series of alleged forgeries, embezzlements and other crimes by Iowa attorneys, the State Supreme Court handed down a ruling that requires lawyer bonding, mandatory auditing and a stiff annual individual levy.

According to terms of the new rule, lawyers must consent to an audit of their records if a question is raised about the handling of funds in their care. They also must, as a condition of continuing to practice in the state, file an annual statement that asks, among other things, whether the lawyer has filed his state and federal income tax returns.

Mandatory auditing is common practice in England and elsewhere in the British Commonwealth, but is being uniquely applied in the U.S. under the new Iowa rule, according to F. Lamar Forshée, director of the ABA National Center for Professional Discipline.

The security fund also is noteworthy in the stiffness of the levy required - from $50 to $100 per year from lawyers who represent clients and $25 annually from those who do not, such as judges and corporate counsel.

The Iowa State Bar Association had urged establishment of the $600,000 security fund. An estimated $950,000 allegedly was taken from clients during an 18-month period, of which about $150,000 was not covered by insurance or bonding.

A seven-member commission named by the court to oversee the fund includes two non-lawyer members, as recommended by the state bar, to assure the public that the commission's decisions "are not concocted by lawyers to cover up for other lawyers."

Chief Justice C. Edwin Moore says the security fund will reimburse clients "in those few cases in which attorneys betray their trust." Assessments for the fund will drop if claims decrease and may go up if losses continue.

- ABA News
Today: We're going to learn about contracts.

Cookie Monster: Oh boy, Kermit! Do I get cookies!

Kermit: Well, we'll see about that.

Cookie Monster: OK, Cookie Monster, I'm going to give you a cookie every minute for 5 minutes if you'll sit still for the whole time.

Cookie Monster: Minutes up, where's my cookie?

Cookie Monster: Why should I give you a cookie? You didn't tell me you accepted my offer.

Cookie Monster: What a mean! I sat still!

Cookie Monster: Excellent, you've just learned reliance.

Cookie Monster: Well, where's my cookie?

Cookie Monster: Why should I give you a cookie? How do I know you're going to sit still for the whole time?

Cookie Monster: Why should I sit still anymore if you don't give me my cookie?

Cookie Monster: Very good!

Cookie Monster: We'll have to go down to Roger to straighten this out.

Cookie Monster: Hey, wait Cookie Monster!

Cookie Monster: Self-help is not a contract remedy.

Cookie Monster: Possession, nine points of the law.