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BEFORE...
LIST DAY BASH
May 2, 1975 at 3:15

A celebration will be held on the last day of classes, beginning at 3:15 with cocktails in the Lawyer's Club Lounge.

The party will then move out onto the lawn where hamburgers will be grilled and beer and other nourishment will be provided.

People who do not live in the Lawyer's Club must purchase a meal ticket by NOON, APRIL 18 if they wish to eat supper on the lawn. The price has been reduced to $2.25, in honor of the occasion.

Dear R.G.:

I'd like to invite all members of the Law School community to come to Hill Auditorium tomorrow night at 8:00 to enjoy the annual Spring Concert of the University of Michigan Men's Glee Club, of which I am a member. Highlights of the program will include "Old Man River," with our director, Willis Patterson, as bass soloist. Brahms' "Alto Rhapsody" will also be performed by Rosemary Russell, assistant professor of music—the first time a female soloist has appeared in concert with the Glee Club in its 116-year history.

We'll also be singing songs by Mozart, Verdi, Schuetky and Kodaly, as well as several spirituals and Michigan songs, and "The Friars" (the Glee Club's octet) will be providing their popular blend of music and show biz humor.

Tickets are $1.50, $2.50 and $3.50 and are on sale today and Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 5 p.m. at Hill Auditorium box office, so plan to take a break Saturday night and hear our concert. You'll really enjoy it!

--Bruce Johnson

INFORMAL MEETING ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT INTERNSHIP PROGRAM:

Next Tuesday evening, April 15, John Reitz and Robert Wessely will hold an informal session at 7:00 PM in the Faculty Dining Room for those interested in learning more about the State Department internship, either as prospective participants or to gain a greater insight into the decision-making process of our principle foreign-policy agency. Each will speak briefly and answer all questions. Numerous people have asked about this program, and it is hoped this will meet those requests.

FILM SERIES

Friday, April 11, the Law School Film Series will present All the King's Men, starring Broderick Crawford and Mercedes McCambridge. The film won three academy awards: Best Picture, Best Actor and Best Supporting Actress. Show times are at 7 and 9 P.M. in Room 100, Hutchins Hall. Law students are admitted free; non-law fee is $1.00.

PLACEMENT NOTES

FIRST AND SECOND YEAR STUDENTS - Every spring the Placement Office sends to prospective employers a booklet listing next year's second and third year students. Included in the booklet is the home and local addresses of each student and her or his undergraduate major and minor. This information is very helpful to the recruiters. Please fill out the form requesting this information. They are available outside Room 100 and in the Placement Office, 210 Hutchins Hall. If you do not want your name included please indicate this to us. Otherwise, we obtain the information from the registrar's office.

If you have accepted a position, please report it to the Placement Office.

All participants in the National Conference on Women and the Law: Please submit typewritten notes on all the seminars and overviews which you attended. Type notes for each program on a separate page and type your name somewhere on the page. Please deposit the notes in the manila folder on the door of the Women's Office by Monday, April 14th at 3 P.M. Notes will be compiled and reproduced for faculty and student consumption.
CREASE BALL
EVERYONE INVITED...

The Crease Ball will be held this year on Saturday night, April 19, from 9:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. in the Lawyers' Club lounge. The Crease Ball is the annual Spring dance for the Law School community. Tickets this year are $1 per person, a substantial reduction from the $6-per-couple price of last year.

Last year, the ball was very successful. There were even several faculty members present. This year's event will probably be equally entertaining. The band for this year is "Ron Sanders and the Fabulous Imperials". (Thanks to John Midgely who initially recommended them.) I heard them play two weeks ago at a dance held by a fraternity. During the half-hour that I listened to them, they were excellent. Also, the other listeners I talked to at the party gave unanimous good reviews.

The Crease Ball cannot provide liquor because of the low ticket price. However, mixers will be provided. Two bartenders will be available. If the drink system follows last year's, any bottle you bring will be tagged and kept up with by the bartenders.

Tickets are on sale today from 9:00 to 12:00 outside room 100. Next week, see any member of the Barristers for tickets. Hope you can come and enjoy it.

SUMMER SUBLET

One Bedroom in Large, Modern, Sunny two bedroom apartment. Two blocks from the Law Quad. Furnished, Air-Conditioned, Large Balcony, well-supplied kitchen. Ideal for one or two persons. Willing to rent for any of the various Law School Summer Sessions.

Call: 994-5831, ask for Jon. Dinner time is best time to reach me.

LOOKING FOR A SUBLET?

Available May 16 to Aug. 20. (Why pay for an extra 1/3 month Sublet a bedroom in a modern 2-brm. apt. AIR-CO NDITIONED! (It sure beats sweating in the Law Club!), 1 1/2 baths, dishwasher, cable TV, balcony parking and MUCH more! Call 769-7653 if interested. Rent is negotiable. 4 blks to Quad.

Pam Hyde called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The minutes of last week's meeting were approved.

Kemp Harshman, a third-year student, who has been putting together this Law School Directory, introduced Bob Garff of the School of Business Administration. Bob has agreed to carry on the work of publishing the directory for 75% of the profits. Last year Kemp paid (approximately) $350 for printing costs, $125 for telephone expenses, $50 for supplies, and $125 for wages. Revenue from advertising paid these expenses and netted a profit of about $260, $65 of which went to the Senate. Questions were raised about the number of student's names which were left out of the directory, and Kemp explained that he had difficulty reaching all students during registration and that not all people had phones that early in the year. Jon Karp moved that the Senate appoint Bob Garff to take over publication of the directory for next year and that the administration be strongly urged to provide a station during registration in order for a person to collect names, addresses and phone numbers of students for the directory. The motion passed unanimously.

Jon Karp reported that, after considering alternative rules of procedure, he recommended that the Senate continue to follow Robert's Rules of Order. The Senate unanimously approved a nomination by Bertie Butts that Jon be appointed Parliamentarian.

Pam reported that she had been contacted by Jude Huettman for the Washtenaw County Bar Association. They are planning to have Martha Griffiths here for Law Day, April 18. Ms. Griffiths will be the keynote speaker at a steak dinner to be held in the Michigan League at 6:00 p.m. Everyone is invited. Tickets are $8.50, and people wishing to attend must make reservations by Friday, April 11. Ms. Griffiths has agreed to come two hours early and will meet with students and faculty of the Law School from 4:15 to 6:00 p.m. in the Cook Room. A motion by Jon Karp to donate $50 to the Washtenaw County Bar Association in order to defray
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the expense of the honorarium passed with no opposition.

A suggestion from Rhonda Rivera that students with lockers be charged a fee of $5 per year as a novel way to supply money to student affairs was tabled until the morning of April 21.

Pam reported also that Rhonda Rivera wanted to request $250 be spent on two evening activities for the incoming summer starters in connection with their orientation. Plans for these evenings have not been formalized. The Senate voted to allocate $150 and to reconsider the amount when more definite plans are submitted.

In regard to the annual event planned for May 2, the last day of classes, Pam stated that a final was being given from 3:00 to 6:00 that afternoon. Jon reported that he had the kitchen to know by April 16 how many non-Lawyer's Club residents would be eating the picnic dinner. Barbecued hamburgers, salads, dessert, and condiments will be served for $2.25 for non-residents. The Senate will provide beer for the guests, which will follow a cocktail party in the Lawyer's Club Lounge. Sharon Williams said she had been unable to find a band which would play for free, but that a student had volunteered to play a tape recorder. The consensus was that this music would have to be postponed until the final was over.

Pam discussed some recommendations which had been made by the Dean. He asked that the LSSS allocate no funds for organizations' recruitment and admissions efforts. He wanted those activities to be coordinated with his office and the admissions office. The Dean also asked that the Senate formulate a policy for funding travel to conferences, which would be applied across the board. He wanted requests for funds in excess of the Senate policy limit referred to him; and he would provide the money from his funds or, if he felt the request was excessive, refer the group to the LSSS for its recommendation.

Discussion on this led to the following resolution: The Senate will formulate a policy for funding travel to conferences, but requests for money in excess of the policy limits may be considered by the Senate, in which ease it will attempt to work out an arrangement with the Dean for any extra funds which the Senate deems reasonable. The resolution passed without opposition.

The Senate next considered the Speaker's Committee's Policies and Guidelines for Support of Speaker Programs Sponsored by Student Groups in the Law School. The following amendments were approved: (1) page 1, third line of text, replace the word "committee" with "voting membership"; (2) page 2, part D, delete the first line of text under number 1; (3) page 2, number 7 under D, add "Reasonable efforts shall be made to publicize meetings in advance,"; (4) page 3, second to last line, change "approval of" to "consultation with"; (5) page 5, under g, delete last three lines of l.d.

Bruce Hiler presented a set of suggested policies. The Senate unanimously approved a resolution proposed by Kathy Krieger that the Dean be requested to write an explanation of how the $15 registration fee is spent to be printed in the catalog and on Gestas.

After numerous amendments the Budget Policy was adopted; it appears as amended as an appendix to these minutes.

Discussion next centered on a policy for funding trips to conferences. A motion that the Senate limit each organization to $200 for each national conference and $50 for each local conference was defeated 2-6.

The policy guideline which was adopted provided that funding for a national conference be based on a unit consisting of a registration fee and round-trip transportation for one person; that funding for each group can be more or less than one unit depending on the total amount allocated for conference funding, which total shall be at an event exceed 10% of the LSSS. This proposal met no opposition.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.

Playhouse Road
LSSS Secretary
AGENDA
For April 11, 1975

Next year's budget will be decided, and no other business will be considered. The meeting will begin at 6:00 p.m. in the Faculty Dining Room of the Lawyer's Club.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT -- LSSS

As most of you well know, I recently became President of Law School Student Senate. The election was notable in that approximately 620 people voted! That's over 50% of the Law School. I find that encouraging that we as students are taking more than just a critical interest in Student government.

SO, to keep up the interest, I intend from time to time to keep you posted on what LSSS is doing. In the process, I will be asking for help from you in certain areas. Monday night, March 31, 1975, the new Senate officially took over. Out of that meeting came a few things of which I think you should be aware.

FIRST: LSSS intends to try its best administratively this year. Therefore, a tentative AGENDA for the next meeting will be posted on the second-floor LSSS bulletin board and printed in RG. These agendas should be posted by Wednesday following our Monday night meetings and printed in RG the Friday following our Monday meeting. Hopefully this will keep you informed as to up-coming topics of discussion and help us to better organize our meetings.

In order to make this device effective, we need your cooperation. Any matter you wish to bring before the Senate must be noted a week in advance. For example, if you want the Senate to consider something on, say, Monday, April 21, then we need to know about it before 7:00 p.m. Monday, April 14. You can contact any senator personally or by mail through Lawyers Club (every senator will have a mailbox near the desk) or through the mailbox for LSSS in Room 300.

While certain exceptions to this rule can be made in cases of extreme emergency, I intend to be pretty strict on this one, so start thinking ahead and check the agenda ahead of time so you will know what we will be doing at our next meeting.

SECOND: At our first meeting, a committee of four was formed to study LSSS BY-LAWS and possible suggestions for update and revision. We want to hear from you on this! George Vinyard, Jon Karp, Kathy Krieger, or Bertie Butts are the people to see. And, if you would be willing to take an active part on the committee, let us know.

THIRD: We are soon going to have an official Parliamentarian selected from among our members. Big Deal, huh? Well, we're hoping this will aid us in limiting needless and unwarranted lengthy meetings. I realize of course that this can cut both ways, i.e., make for more effective discussions or stiffle useful hashing out of issues. Hopefully, we can succeed in the former without failing because of the latter.

FOURTH: In the past, we have had difficulty getting people to take on the responsibility for some of the less prestigious tasks that have to be performed by our standing committees. These SENATE COMMITTEES are the Social Committee, the Film Committee, the Sports Committee, and the Speakers Committee. If you aren't willing to help us do the work, then we aren't going to be willing to listen to your complaints about shitty films, fucked up socials, disorganized intramurals, and irrelevant or no speakers. SO, volunteer for some of these committee positions and all our lives will be easier.

FIFTH: Budget hearings are coming up. We've decided this year (thanks to Bruce Hiler for the idea) to set out a written statement of POLICY ABOUT BUDGETING before we begin. Budget hearings are important and time-consuming. They take a full 8-10-hour Saturday and a good 4-hour Monday night meeting to hash through. So these policy statements will be a big step in coordinating budgets and expenditures for next year. Again, if you have any gripes or ideas about spending money, tell Bruce or one of the other senators so we can get a sense of where you want us to be.

Most of this stuff is administrative bunk that has to be dealt with by any new Senate. But we're asking that you aid us in instituting some changes; now--administratively; later -- substantively.

Remember:
1) AGENDA -- get it in a week ahead if you want to be heard.
2) BY-LAWS -- suggestions for revision go to George, Bertie, Jon, or Kathy.
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3) MEETINGS -- they are all open. If you have something to say or just want to listen, 7:00 Monday nights, Faculty Dining Room, Lawyers Club.

4) COMMITTEES -- Put up or shut up!

5) BUDGETS -- ideas on allocating or spending go to Bruce (note: this is as to budgeting policy. Bertie is definitely still treasurer.)

Thanks. More later as the year goes on.

Pamela S. Hyde
ISSS
President

--- But most of the time, we is the stickee

Flip Wilson

Yes hockey fans, it's playoff time again and the Student Redwings have failed to make the playoffs once more. The Faculty Bruins are resting up for the tough playoff road ahead, and the favored Administration Flyers are expected to be tougher than ever as they ended the season injury-free. Only the Revue Habs and the Tail-Chasers Sabres have the big guns (with gunners) to be able to stand a chance against the perennial champion Flyers and Bruins. For the Student Redwings, though, the season is over.

The Brownie Points are adding up and all those long hours in the library are ready to pay off. If I just work a little extra during finals, maybe skip breakfasts, I'll get my A's and prove to all those lazy, leftists and minorities bastards that they are just intellectually inferior and don't even belong in the same school as me (I?). I know I'm better than 3/4, or even 90% of these common peons and the finals will show these pedestrians exactly where they stand. Free Bob Showalter!

As is true of all good team leaders, Our Good Dean set the example for his Flyer teammates as he started the play-off season with a rush. But just because he is only leading, he is not protected from having penalties called on him, to-wit:

2 min: delay of game -- for just being responsible for his "Dean's Report"

2 min: elbowing -- for totally ignoring the obvious consumer (law students) demands evidenced by the giant waiting lists for the Clinic, the Lawyer as a Negotiator, and Trial Practice -- any competent administrator would solve this problem, and any Dean of any school would not allow the educational requests of the students be so stifled.

2 min: kicking and 5 min major for same -- for using the rationale of not wanting to change policies because it may cause the Great Law School to be so committed for forty years -- a) it should be committed, and so should everyone in it, b) in other words, I don't want to hurt the Deanship, I must think of the Deans who come after me (Free Dick Nixon, contribute to the Richard Nixon Justice Fund), and c) in other words, you've waited 200 years, but who am I to say that that's enough? Why not wait just a few more years, boy ••• (uh) son.

2 min: high sticking -- for completely passing over real, realistic, responsible, and long over-due requests of minority (and other) student groups in a "report" in which he tried to claim he is being responsive. What Secretariat did do is expose (at least to myself for the first time) his own immense lack of responsiveness and policies of hinderance. His claim of responsiveness is outright misrepresentation.

2 min charging and 5 min major for same -- for perpetuating the biggest misrepresentation of all ... that this is a
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Although lawyers tell me that this place teaches nothing but vocabulary and not to turn your back on a person with a knife, the general public is misled into believing that we are learning something about being a lawyer. As an ex-member of this ignorant group, I know I have been misrepresented to in a knowing and intentional attempt (successful, too) to defraud the potential law school consumer (ie student).

In other action around the league, as the regular season draws to a close:

2 min: delay of game - Prof. Sandalow for boring to tears

2 min: spearing - Prof. Kahn for twisting the knife

game misconduct - those pros who have an actual private monetary interest in NOT teaching us anything useful since they also have jobs teaching Bar Review courses (didn't know that, did you? that the same old fool who wouldn't teach you anything at a cost of $2800/ year, is the same one you pay to teach it to you when you're out and discover he didn't teach it to you the first time).

Yale Kamisar receives the Dave Schultz Award by amassing two charging penalties, one elbowing penalty, a penalty for high sticking, and a ten minute major for fighting (18 minutes total), all in only one period. Also levied during the period was a ten minute major for fighting to an unidentified maleficient.

Burgess Allison

KUNG POOILERY

For you who think that the Law School thought reform process is unlike anything else in the world, think upon these selected aphorisms from Japan and China.

Are you sure you will never once make the right response to your favorite ersatz Socrates?

馬鹿にも一藝

Even a fool may chance to say a wise thing.

When you know the answer, but hesitate to speak, remember that

潜龍無用

A concealed dragon is of no use.

After you have given what you thought was the right answer, you may realize that you have

弄巧成拙

tried to show that you are skillful and clever, but have only made a fool of yourself. Chinese.

Have you ever wondered what T.J. really thinks of the bottom half of the class?

因上手が知れる

Because of the unskilled, the skilled are recognized. Japanese.

If your goal in life is wealth and power, Kwai Chang Caine advises that

與惡人交如入鮑魚之肆久而不聞其臭

Dealing with bad people is like entering a fish market: after a while, you no longer notice the stench.

Signed

Grasshopper
Dear Editor:
Thank you, Section 5, for caring enough to do something. While
the need for an Alternative Practices Conference speaks ill of
this law school, your efforts on behalf of all of us are a happy
sign indeed.

I was distressed, however, that
the conference had a political
orientation. Even if engaging
in corporate practice is a politi­
cal stand, surely the alter­
native is not so narrow. By
presenting almost exclusively
lawyers of leftist/radical per­
suasion, you conveyed the impres­sion that one must either work
for a corporation or take a stand
with the Movement. As a descrip­tive matter, this is simply not
an accurate picture of the non­
corporate world. If your goal
was hortatory, I submit that your
aims would have been better served
by giving undecided students a
broader spectrum of choice.
There are many on the verge of
interviewing and job-seeking in
the traditional manner. Such
persons were more likely turned
off than on by the likes of
Buck Davis explaining to us
"petit bourgeois" why the small
businessman is not deserving of
his services.

s/Peter Winkler

Editor, Res Gestae:

Prof. Kahn apparently felt that my letter
criticizing his article on the Amnesty
Program was a personal attack on him and
obscured the important issues. Matching
Latin phrases with Prof. Kahn, I feel that
if my letter was an ad hominem attack, it
was only because he was speaking ex cathedra.

While I wrote the letter in anger, I am
satisfied that its main idea is clear, that
it is, leaving the U.S. to avoid service in
Viet-Nam was for many men a moral decision
and for others, in light of recent events
in Viet-Nam, a sensible one. I did not in­
tend to attack the federal government's
decision-making process as Prof. Kahn im­
plies. I also did not intend to question
Prof. Kahn's courage. I do, however,
question Prof. Kahn's moral credibility
since he demands that men accept the burden
of serving in Viet-Nam when he has not been
faced with the same burden nor volunteered
to go himself. I do not feel Prof. Kahn
has the right to criticize others' moral
decisions until he has shown us his own
moral equality.

I would respect and listen to Prof. Kahn if
he would recognize what moral issues are
involved and show commitment to the cause
he is willing to have men die for. Until
that time I feel, as Prof. Kahn wrote in
his article on Amnesty, that "For me, I am
skeptical of the altruistic motives of those
who preserved their own safety at the
sacrifice of the safety of others . . . ."

S/Scott Ewbank

To The Editor:

My congratulations to Josh Green for his
"Classics" piece (including the "Note) in
April 4 RG. Not since Regina v. Ojibway
have I seen such healthy parody in these
pages. I was reminded of the program
notes from a recent concert, where
Prokofieff was characterized as a composer
who, "after a few startling excursions
into the grotesque and only an occasional
sojourn into the cacophonous realm of the
musical modernism of his day, produced music
that was not merely interesting and clever
but brilliantly effective."

S/Joel Pierce
'I STEAL AN IDEA FROM STAN FORD AND CONTINUE SLOWLY DYING'

Recently, three ardent fans of Mr. Ford suggested to me that I conduct an interview with myself much in the manner that he did a few months ago. Since not very many people talk to me anyway about what I do here, I regarded '3' as a 'mandate' of the people and oblige. The following is an interview conducted by the Law School, asking me the questions I am most frequently called upon to answer.

LS: What's the 'R' stand for?

Liv: Alright. I shall announce it to the world at the risk of my never being called 'Richard' again. The 'R' in 'R. Richard Livorine' stands for 'Ralph'.

LS: Do you take the stuff you write in the Gestae seriously?

Liv: Yes, but in a different sort of way. I usually write so carefully, that it is a mindbreaking, laborious, process. I once spent 16 months on one short story. In the Gestae, I just sit down and kick something out, which is a great pleasure to me. Something I need to do.

LS: What kind of response do you get?

Liv: To be frank it is generally pretty negative. That's why I quit for awhile. Not because I can't take criticism, I have over 30 rejection slips to attest to that, but merely because I didn't feel like my column was contributing anything in the minds of the readers. It also exasperated to me, since I thought some of the stuff was pretty good. I worked hard on the 'fight' column I did, I think Ali would have liked it.

LS: So what brought you back?

Liv: Ego. And some people did actually say they liked the things I did. And once at a party, a woman in my section made some very intelligent and constructive criticisms which demonstrated that some people were at least trying to get something out of what I write. There's something to be said of that.

(See Liv p. 9)
LS: Are you a good writer? I mean, do you think you are, really?

Liv: Depends on what you mean. I think the skills, the technique, are mine now. I feel incredibly at home with words. But I really haven't much to say now, which entails my not having much worthwhile to write. But I think I could write 'nothing worthwhile' very well.

LS: Let's just drop it. If you have one complaint about the Law School, what would it be?

Liv: Everybody bitching about something.

LS: That's an easy thing to say.

Liv: It's easy to find something to bitch about. But, when I think about it, it's probably a good thing. Keeps everybody oriented to improvement, whatever the opinions of what constitutes an improvement.

LS: What did you do as an undergraduate?

Liv: Fooled around a lot. If you mean, what did I study, I was in creative writing and analytic philosophy.

LS: It doesn't show.

Liv: I know, and it worries me. A friend of mine described the Law School as 'neutralizing'. I think he's right. It's at least temporarily stifled me a great deal I think. Professor Reed described it for me as a 'suspension of the balance'. I think that's close to it too. Of course describing it doesn't do a hell of a lot of good. I try to keep a journal, but its deteriorated, in quality of ideas and writing. I was making notes from another novel for awhile too, but I haven't worked on it for a long time. But I'll get back to it more and more as I go on. I like this place pretty much. Met a lot of great people here, and the study itself is interesting. Last semester I probably would not have advised someone to go to Law School, I would now.

LS: Do you have a favorite teacher?

Liv: Everybody wants to know that. I'd hate to have to pick one. I think they're all real good, at least the ones I've had.
Some styles appeal to me more than others, but I'd say on the whole they've been very effective, accessible, and deserving of respect.

LS: Pick one.

Liv: I said I'd hate to do that. If you insist I'll say Kamisar. He has an advantage though, since I've taken him twice. His classes are always interesting and entertaining, he teaches you a great deal, or to put it in a better way, you learn a lot in his classes.

LS: We understand you fight with him a lot.

Liv: You heard. His views are much different than mine. He seems to like a challenge, so really I think we get along very well, though he's true he attacks me and my views, attacks them in kind of a personal way.

LS: Maybe he dislikes you.

Liv: I don't think so. To 'dislike' someone, that person has to really affect you. I don't think I affect Kamisar to the extent necessary for him to 'dislike' me. He makes jokes to lighten up the class. Who told you he dislikes me?

LS: The same kid that told you you were a fascist after class.

Liv: Ah yes! My irate friend. He's entitled to his interpretation of my opinions. I doubt Kamisar would agree with him or the large majority of the people in the class. I just don't like people saying they have the right to step on me in asserting their rights. There's nothing fascist about that, only humanist. I'm sure the people in that class wish I'd shut up though.

LS: Any chance of that?

Liv: Not much. My ego is stronger than both of us.

LS: What's the wisest thing you think you've ever said?

Liv: 'Everybody is his own metagory'.

LS: What's a 'metagory'?

GOOD LISTENING (CLASSICAL)

By Joshua Greene

(Note: The purpose of this series is not to identify "the" ideal recording of any particular work. Rather, it is to mention one or more versions of a piece that I have found consistently satisfying and to explain, in non-technical language, the reasons why. I have been listening to classical recordings for over 10 years and base my judgments in part on four years' training in music theory and composition at college.)

2. "Soul" Music --I

I define "soul" music as anything so profoundly moving that I feel purged and "rehumanized" after hearing it. It is music that produces in me the same sensations as attending a great religious experience or an extraordinary performance of a deeply-human play such as King Lear. While this definition is hardly more useful than is Justice Stewart's characterization of pornography ("I know it when I see it"), it should suggest the kind of music I choose to classify as music for the soul. Probably the two pieces I shall discuss in this article will illustrate what I mean by the term better than any verbal description I can offer.

Schubert's Sonata in B Flat Major, Op. Posth. (D. 960), is one of a handful of works that manages to weave an incredible tapestry from the simplest of materials. Only it is not so simple! Pianists the order of Rubinstein have confessed to giving up any hope of fully comprehending, much less communicating, the contents of this work; and even after numerous listenings I cannot begin to explain why little things, like the parallel movement of the melody and an inner voice in the left hand in the main theme of the first movement, have such a profound effect here but not in other music. Maybe a detailed analysis would reveal that the piece has a remarkable purity, a freedom from unnecessary embellishment and elaboration, to which its profundity can be attributed. Having neither read such an analysis nor attempted one myself, I can simply point to the music and marvel.

While I've heard only two recordings of the piece, Rubinstein's (on RCA) and Schnabel's (now on EMI), I can strongly recommend the
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second as a model of beautiful and thoughtful musicmaking. Unlike Rubinstein, who chooses to play the piece virtually without expression, Schnabel varies his dynamics, tempo, and attacks to communicate the patterns and many of the broad relationships in the piece. In this recording phrases are clearly delineated without being totally disconnected. Major sections, such as that marked by the mysterious move to C-sharp minor in the first movement, are separated by enough breathing space so as not to overwhelm the very different music that precedes it. While the sound on this recording is less than spectacular (The disk dates from 1939), the performance, especially of the second movement, is well worth owning. As currently packaged, it comes in a three-record set entitled "Schnabel and Schubert" that contains, besides the sonata, performances of the D-major Sonata that Ashkenazy played here last month, the Moments Musicaux, and several pieces for piano four-hands.

The second piece I shall mention is Beethoven's Sonata No. 32 for Piano in C Minor, Op. 111. For those accustomed to early and middle Beethoven, the freedom of the Arietta of this work will come as a profound shock. Again, simple materials -- this time, a brief melody and complementary elaboration -- are expanded to make a piece of transcendent beauty and emotion. Here, however, the basic unit is repeated over and over, each time acquiring more intricacy, until the final restatement comes upon the listener as a sign of quiet but resolute victory over-all-encompassing struggle. Why do the passages of triplets and incredibly-long trills that in other music would sound imane or tedious here produce the most profound sensations of suffering and release? Perhaps there is something to the idea that simple but carefully chosen materials, fully exploited, produce in music as in other arts the greatest masterpieces.

As for recordings, I again prefer Schnabel's old performance (now on Seraphim) to the others I've heard (Brendel's, in his Vox Box recording of all thirty-two sonatas, and an old Michelangelli performance on Angel now discontinued), although the Michelangelli recording contains a beautiful version of the Arietta. There is something about Schnabel's attention to detail (See Josh p.13)

JOBS

It is well known that Res Gestae is primarily a humorous newspaper, something to relieve the tedium of law school. But, as the saying goes (which I just made up), levity doesn't get you a job. So RG commissioned me (unfortunately for no compensation other than the promise of NO by-line) to go upstairs and see Nancy Krieger to find out what's happening at the Placement Office.

Surprisingly, she said that she didn't really feel that less people have jobs this year than other years, although there has been more concern over finding jobs. She noted that "People are coming into the office to ask questions who normally wouldn't feel the need."

Although there could be no comparison with other years, no, Krieger estimated that over half of the third-year students had jobs and that the same was probably true for second-year students. She also predicted that the usual 72-75% "completion rate" would be met.

In view of the increased student interest in the Placement Office, I asked Nancy if she had been involved in any discussions that might lead to different practices next fall. She commented, 'As usual, the sign-up procedure is being reviewed. Everyone is concerned about it; the students complain about it; but it's hard to come up with a fairer alternative procedure.'

Suggestions include: Computerization, a lottery system, hanging the sign-up sheets on a first-come first-serve basis, signing up 1 day a week for an entire week, or having each person list a few firms on a preferred list with the chances for other firms as it is now. After noting what she felt was wrong with each of those suggestions, Ms. Krieger commented, 'i don't think any of those will work as well as the system we have now, even with the amount of budging that we have.' She also said, however, that she was willing to reconsider any of those suggestions with anyone who was interested in discussing the sign-up procedure with her.

Since growing numbers of students have found that interviewing cannot totally fill their needs, I inquired as to what Placement was doing to attract the attention of prospective employers that don't come... (See HU p.13)
that makes the long trill passages of the Arietta, for example, more than unbearably long sequences of notes, something I miss in Brendel's sluggish rendition. While Schnabel's version is hardly the last word on this piece, it is certainly a good introduction to a work that one could profitably study for many years without exhausting.

For those interested in "preparing" for the upcoming Horowitz recital, I have been told that Schumann's Kinderscenen, Op. 15, the first Chopin Ballade, and a Clementi sonata will be on the program. Recordings of all these works are available at the record room on the second floor of the UGLI, a great place to visit if you've never seen it. While the records don't circulate, you can hear them on rickety turntables and observe the many students who try to soften the gruff edge of studying with a little music.
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the proper number is not as important as the necessity of giving the most over-burdened courts additional help without more delay.

(2) Immediate action to provide additional appropriations for equipment and personnel to comply with the Act.

We are encouraged that some members of Congress have indicated they recognize the needs created by this Act and have expressed their support for meeting those needs. Very recently one Senator stated:

"In passing this measure [the Speedy Trial Act], Congress is saying to the Federal Courts: Tell us what you need to clear away this backlog of untried cases and we will give it to you. But when we give you the tools, we will expect results."

Similar views have been expressed by other members of both Houses and federal judges agree fully.

We in the Judiciary find ourselves in a position not unlike that expressed by Winston Churchill in writing to President Roosevelt during World War II when Churchill said: "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

It is now up to you—see to it that Congress gives "us the tools" and we will do the job.

A possible incidental advantage will be that the Placement Office will be able to find out whether an alum would be willing to talk to interested students as a general resource person; for example, giving some background as to a firm and/or an area so that students can ask those "incessive" or "tough" questions recruiters love to hear.

This article will supplement the basically statistical article that appears each year in Law Quad Notes. Ms. Krieger noted, "this will make the thrust more personal—showing that we have a diversified student body—and less statistical. Statistics always give the impression that students are interested only on Corporate firms."

It appears that the reason why the statistics lie is that they aren't broken down by geographical distribution but by type of job. Thus, while certain areas, the percentage of graduates entering corporate firms is low. Overall, figures for corporate firms predominate. Nancy said, "This new article will help demonstrate that people do go to Des Moines and Marquette."

She ended the interview by saying, "I feel the Placement Office is a student office; it ought to be responsive to what the student wants - but without student input we don't know." Times are rough. If you haven't cared before - maybe now's the time to start caring.

S/Lean HUNGRY & UNEMPLOYED
ANNUAL REPORT
ON
THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

Remarks of
WARREN E. BURGER
CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
MID-WINTER MEETING
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

FEBRUARY 23, 1975

Since 1970 you have invited me each year to report to you on the problems and progress of the Judicial branch and I welcome this invitation to meet with you again. In the past I have made this report at the annual meeting, but it was not possible to do so last summer. One compensation, however, of meeting with a smaller group at the mid-winter meeting in February, rather than the much larger group in August, is that problems calling for legislative action may be pursued by you with the Congress early in its first session rather than at its end.

As the most representative organization and spokesman for the legal profession of our Nation, you have played the major role on behalf of the profession and the courts before the public and the Congress of the United States.

Many of the problems of the courts are closely related to the quality and competence of the principal participants—the contending lawyers and the judges—and the standards of professional conduct that govern in the courts.

The great increase in the demand for lawyers in the administration of criminal justice can be traced in large part to several desirable developments. Various enactments of Congress and decisions of the courts have sought to make more certain that justice will be administered in an even-handed way, and that there will be faithful compliance with the statutes and Constitutional provisions for the protection of the rights of accused persons.

These developments have occurred in a period of rising crime, and of mounting public concern over crime. Taken together these factors have materially increased the burdens on the federal courts, and not all aspects of those added burdens are readily apparent. Even a casual review of the figures, however, shows that the number of cases in federal courts rose 25 percent between 1964 and 1974. Much less well known to
the public is the fact that civil case filings have increased at more than double this rate, that is, by 55 percent. The total combined increase in civil and criminal filings in that 10-year period was 45 percent, outstripping the increased number of federal judges. And the most recent figures suggest a continuing upturn in district court filings.

An even more significant trend is that the proportion of federal criminal defendants actually going to trial has grown by one-fourth. In 10 years the number of criminal trials has increased more than 60 percent, and this was accompanied by an increase in the length of criminal trials. We see, therefore, that there are new and substantial upturns in the burdens of trial courts that have not been clearly perceived.3

In 1967 at Ripon College I called attention to the interaction of the Criminal Justice Act and the Bail Reform Act in the following terms:

"It sometimes happens that a development in the law which is highly desirable, standing alone, interacts with an equally desirable improvement and produces a result which is largely or even totally lacking in social utility. Let me give one example: the bail reforms of recent years were long overdue and helped to give meaning to the constitutional provisions on bail; similarly the decisions and statutes assuring a lawyer to every person charged with serious crime, were long overdue. Now look at the interaction: every person charged has a lawyer supplied to him and at the same time he has enlarged rights to be released without posting a conventional bail bond.

"We can now see that in a great many cases, no matter how strong the evidence against him, or how desirable the long range value of a guilty plea and the benefits of reduced charges and more moderate sentencing, the two 'good' things—bail reform and free defense—interact to discourage a guilty plea because the 'jail house grapevine' tells the accused that the thing to do is enter a not guilty plea, demand release without bond, and then use every device of pretrial motions, demands for a new lawyer, and whatnot to delay the moment of truth of the trial day. This means up to two years' freedom during which witnesses might die, or move, or forget details while the case drags on the calendar and consumes untold time of judges, lawyers and court staffs to process motions and continuances. This is one of the large factors in the congestion of the....

3 In 1967 at Ripon College I called attention to the interaction of the Criminal Justice Act and the Bail Reform Act in the following terms:

"It sometimes happens that a development in the law which is highly desirable, standing alone, interacts with an equally desirable improvement and produces a result which is largely or even totally lacking in social utility. Let me give one example: the bail reforms of recent years were long overdue and helped to give meaning to the constitutional provisions on bail; similarly the decisions and statutes assuring a lawyer to every person charged with serious crime, were long overdue. Now look at the interaction: every person charged has a lawyer supplied to him and at the same time he has enlarged rights to be released without posting a conventional bail bond.

"We can now see that in a great many cases, no matter how strong the evidence against him, or how desirable the long range value of a guilty plea and the benefits of reduced charges and more moderate sentencing, the two 'good' things—bail reform and free defense—interact to discourage a guilty plea because the 'jail house grapevine' tells the accused that the thing to do is enter a not guilty plea, demand release without bond, and then use every device of pretrial motions, demands for a new lawyer, and whatnot to delay the moment of truth of the trial day. This means up to two years' freedom during which witnesses might die, or move, or forget details while the case drags on the calendar and consumes untold time of judges, lawyers and court staffs to process motions and continuances. This is one of the large factors in the congestion of the....
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There has also been a substantial increase in the work of courts of appeals. In 1964 approximately 33 percent of all persons convicted at trial took advantage of the statutory right to appeal. In 1974 almost 75 percent of those convicted appealed. These figures serve to underscore the urgent need for more courts of appeals judgeships. Few people know, for example, that there have been no increases in judgeships for the courts of appeals since 1968, and this has brought about an extraordinary 80 percent increase in cases per judgeship. Having been a Court of Appeals judge for 14 years, I assure you I can understand what an 80 percent increase means.

My purpose in presenting these figures to you is not to question the absolute right of every accused person to require the Government to prove guilt in an adversary proceeding or to take an appeal. What I am saying is that when the system is changed in a way that brings more cases into the courts, we must be given the tools.

This increase in criminal trials and appeals generated not only a large increase in public defenders but also in prosecutors. In this 10-year period staff attorneys in the 94 offices of United States Attorneys increased from about 700 to more than 1,200. While the district courts were trying to cope with a larger increase in cases, they were also trying to adjust to the infusion of this host of new lawyers, many of whom had had little experience in litigation and a minimum of training for the difficult and exacting task of prosecuting or defending a criminal case.

Countless training seminars have been held, many of them sponsored by bar associations, including the Association, and by the Department of Justice, but the average tenure of lawyers in the office of United States Attorneys and on public defender staffs is relatively brief.
The on-the-job training of these new lawyers will be enormously valuable to them and, I would hope, ultimately, for our profession. But the short-range impact has created serious problems for trial judges. No private law firm could function effectively, and perhaps could not even survive, with that kind of rapid turnover of personnel.

The standards for selection and the tenure and compensation of these lawyers, on whom the system of justice must depend, should be made sufficiently attractive so that the federal courts will not continue to be used as a "bush league" facility to train trial lawyers for private practice.

No other developed country in the world operates with the casual attitude we exhibit toward the need for qualified advocates on both sides of the table in the administration of criminal justice. This has placed on federal trial judges an enormous additional burden in terms of guiding a large proportion of both the prosecutors and the defense counsel on how to try a case. I urge all state and local bar associations to cooperate with the courts to establish a screening process so that no lawyer appears in federal court unless certain minimum standards of training and experience are met. Several federal districts are developing an examining and screening process for Criminal Justice Act attorneys and that concept should be broadened and developed for all federal courts.

The problem of regulating and disciplining the conduct of lawyers is far more complex in the United States, where we train lawyers in more than 150 law schools, as compared with a country like England, for example, where there is a centralized and comprehensive training facility for all trial lawyers. In England there are, as we know, two associations, one embracing all the barristers and one for the solicitors. The admission of lawyers to practice in the courts of general jurisdiction is also centralized and coordinated in a central governing body. In this country admission power is distributed among more than 50 independent state bodies and in 94 federal districts. England has a total of only about 33,000 lawyers—barristers and solicitors—and we have more than 300,000. (Parenthetically, our law schools graduated approximately 33,000 in the past year!) Our diversity has many advantages but it also presents a staggering problem of enforcing standards, and we have hardly scratched the surface of the problem.

Paralleling the lack of litigation training and experience of many of the lawyers appearing in the courts is the absence of adequate education in standards of professional ethics and conduct. This is not confined by any means to the trial of cases—it is pervasive throughout our profession and it is a subject we have treated with a mixture of apathy and inertia. The 1970 report of the Association's Committee on Disciplinary Enforcement, chaired by my distinguished colleague Justice Tom Clark, is one of the few bright spots in this area. The problem is complicated because of the sheer magnitude of the task of convincing 150 law schools and more than 50 bar associations—to say nothing of more than 50 courts of last resort—to embark on a program of education and enforcement of the professional standards this association has announced. Those standards were brought up-to-date in 1970 after five years of careful study by a distinguished committee under the chairmanship of Edward L. Wright. They were supplemented in 1971 by a comprehensive report adopted as part of the monumental ABA Criminal Justice Standards Project and specifically directed to the standards for the prosecutors and defense counsel.

The Association's Center for Professional Discipline has now recommended rules for disciplinary proceedings and about half of the States have responded. This is an excellent beginning. Each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia should give a very high priority to implementing these recommendations and broadening their
scope to deal with violations of professional standards in the day-to-day practice in the courts as well as in professional relations with clients. I submit that the Association's efforts, and more especially the efforts of state and local bar associations, should be multiplied and the States must provide adequate staffing and financial resources for this important work.

The ultimate function of the lawyer, to provide the lubricant for satisfactory disposition of controversies and for the gradual change and evolution in the law so as to avoid self-help or collective violence, cannot be performed by our profession unless we enforce the standards we profess.

Comments that lawyers need more training in professional skills than law schools presently provide are sometimes met by the response that some judges also fall short of the minimum qualifications for their duties. That is a fair criticism. Of course judges, like lawyers, should continue the educational process and should comply with prescribed standards of judicial conduct. And there has been tremendous growth in continuing education seminars for judges during the past two decades. The National College of the State Judiciary at the University of Nevada, the seminars of the Federal Judicial Center, the Appellate Judges Seminars at New York University, and the developing programs of the new National Center for State Courts all show that judges are trying to improve the quality of their own work. On another occasion, I hope to discuss with you the broad range of problems created by those few judges who do not measure up. In a country with more than 20,000 judges of various kinds and rank, that subject merits our careful attention.

On several occasions, I have referred to the need to bring essential legal services within the means of middle income families by modernizing and simplifying the legal processes commonly used by millions of Americans in such matters as acquiring and financing a home, settling estates, recovering damages for injuries, and for other common problems. The Association's support of these measures must continue. We must not close our eyes to the public disenchantment with legal institutions—a disenchantment which is described in a survey by a special committee of the Association and the American Bar Foundation. That survey is by no means a broadside indictment of our profession, but it should recall to us Bobby Burns' classic line: If we could "see ourselves as others see us." Reading that report should also remind us that the restricted right accorded to members of the bar to perform defined legal services and to appear in the courts as attorneys for others, carries with it a high public duty that our profession has acknowledged since its beginnings. That public obligation must be both recognized and performed.

There are many other problems that call for attention by the Association and in many cases action by Congress, and I will refer to only a few of them to remind you that they remain unsolved:

1. The Congress should limit diversity jurisdiction of federal courts along the lines proposed by the American Law Institute in its 1969 Report.

2. Three-judge district courts should be substantially reduced or eliminated and direct appeals to the Supreme Court should be eliminated. These changes would confirm and restore the Supreme Court's power, established by law 50 years ago, to select for review only the most important cases of broad general importance.

3. The statutes relating to United States magistrates should be clarified to give them broader pow-

2 The ABA has embarked on an important process of rethinking the problems of legal education with its distinguished Task Force on Advanced Judicial and Legal Education and its Standing Committee on Continuing Education of the Bar.
ers, subject to final decision by a district judge, in order to release district judges for full-scale trials.

(4) A “pool” of federal judges should be created along lines proposed by Chief Justice Taft 50 years ago for assignment to meet emergencies in particular United States courts and to meet the needs of courts during the long delays that habitually attend the filling of vacancies. Delay in filling vacancies sometimes runs as long as two or three years, and this seriously impedes the work of a court.

(5) The very inequitable treatment of the salaries of federal judges has placed them 50 percent behind the great bulk of civil service personnel who have received regular in-grade increases in addition to cost-of-living increases given during the past six years to maintain their real income. That inequity must be corrected if we are to retain the able younger judges appointed in the past decade, who are of an age where their family burdens are at a peak. Correcting this serious inequity is also important if the Nation is to attract the ablest lawyers to the federal bench. The Judiciary, along with the Congress and the upper level members of the Executive branch, are among the very few segments of the economy who are being asked to meet 1975 costs of living on 1969 incomes.

Specifically, I now ask you to take the leadership, through state and local bar associations, in support of immediate congressional action as follows:

(1) To provide an immediate 20 percent increase in federal judicial salaries as the first step to remedy the six-year salary “freeze”;

(2) To create a new statutory procedure to make an equitable long-range salary adjustment so as to provide federal judges with treatment comparable to that of other career federal personnel;

(3) To place future salary adjustments on an automatic annual cost-of-living basis once equitable comparability has been achieved.

This is more than a matter of simple fairness and equity; it is a matter of preserving a strong and independent judiciary and maintaining the spirit of the Constitutional prohibition against reduction of salaries of federal judges during their terms of office.

Before turning to another immediate and pressing problem faced by the courts, I remind you that even when remedies will call for increased appropriations, we are dealing with a branch of government whose total budget represents less than one-tenth of one percent of the annual federal budget.

Two months ago Congress enacted the Speedy Trial Act, the first phase of which takes effect July 1 this year. It is a very complex piece of legislation. So far as we can learn, it was drafted without prior consultation with federal judges or court administrative officials, and it passed the Senate by a voice vote without debate, and without dissent. Before the House acted, the Judicial Conference of the United States expressed its view that the legislation was unnecessary. It did so because the Judicial branch had anticipated the underlying idea of the legislation by carefully worked-out pilot programs beginning with one large district from which our own Speedy Trial Rule was evolved. Our Speedy Trial Rule calls for the disposition of criminal cases within six months after indictment but it has not yet had enough time to have a major impact. It was the view of the Judicial Conference, therefore, that more time was needed to work out the problems of administering our own rule, which has precisely the same objective as the Speedy Trial Act. We are fully in accord with Congress that the disposition of cases must be expedited. We agree that the swift disposition of criminal charges is a major deterrent to crime that has not had sufficient attention in the administration of justice. There is, therefore, no
disagreement whatever between the Judiciary and the Congress on the need for speedier trials in criminal cases. But caution must be observed so that in the pursuit of speedier justice in criminal matters we do not do violence either to individual rights or to the public interest. Nor should we risk increasing the delays in disposing of civil matters which likewise have their rightful place in the law.

At this point, I must go back to events preceding the passage of the Speedy Trial Act, and recall that by statute Congress requires the Judicial branch to maintain certain records and conduct studies so the need for additional judges can be evaluated and anticipated every four years. Such an evaluation was completed in 1972, and the Judicial Conference of the United States, acting on reports of the Committee on Court Administration, called on Congress for the creation of 52 new district judgeships and 13 circuit judgeships.

Senator Eastland, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and Senator Burdick, chairman of the Senate subcommittee, promptly set in motion comprehensive studies and hearings in which the views of 36 Chief Judges were heard, along with staff members of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. In 1973 the subcommittee determined that 29 additional district judges were needed. For present purposes we can accept as reasonable the Senate subcommittee figures as to the need for 29 additional trial judges as of 1973. Adequate or not, the Congress has taken no action on the subcommittee's recommendation.

It was subsequent to the Senate subcommittee's recommendation for these 29 additional district judgeships that the Congress proceeded to pass the Speedy Trial Act without any advance evaluation of the needs that would be brought on by that Act. The Speedy Trial Act is a matter of the highest priority since it will go into effect July 1 in its first phase, approximately four months from now. In the short span of two months since the Act was passed, the Administrative Office of the Courts has not been able to make a final evaluation of staff and equipment needs to meet the new Act. But our best estimates show they will call for a large amount of computer equipment and personnel in the Administrative Office and the offices of clerks of court in the 94 federal districts. Not less than 100 additional employees, who must be carefully trained, will be needed. The Chief Judges of the 25 Metropolitan District Courts will meet in March to consider the adjustments that must be made in procedures to meet the provisions of the new Act. Meanwhile, the Administrative Office now estimates that substantially more than the previously requested 52 district judgeships will be required. Since the Congress undertook no "impact study" as to the effects of this Act on the district courts, we have undertaken to do so and the tentative estimate is that the total additional cost for personnel and computer equipment will be upwards of $10 million. A supplemental appropriation request is being prepared for submission to Congress within the next week.

If we are not given the tools to meet the demands of the Speedy Trial Act, with its first phase effective approximately 120 days from now, and its next phase July 1, 1976, the federal courts may be confronted with a crisis, particularly in the larger districts. The Administrative Office, the Federal Judicial Center, and the Committee on Court Administration have done all that could be done in the short time allowed, in terms of planning to meet the burdens of the Act. But it must be remembered that a substantial period of lead time is essential to train personnel and secure equipment.

I therefore urge the Association to give its full support to an urgent request to the Congress for:

(1) Immediate action on the pending Omnibus District Judgeship bills. Whether 29 new judges is
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Law School Student Senate Appropriations Committee
c/o Treasurer
Lawyer's Club
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Dear members of the committee,

On behalf of the residents of the Martha Cook Building, the following proposal is being submitted for consideration by the L.S.S.S. We request that the modest sum of $6,100 be allocated for the renovation of the Martha Cook tennis court. We feel that this request is justifiable because the current deplorable condition of the court is largely due to the use given to the court by residents of the Lawyer's Club. Inasmuch as the number of law students using the court is small, these students clearly constitute a legitimate special interest minority group and are thus entitled to financial support from the L.S.S.S. We feel that the following request for funds and the accompanying stipulations represent the best interests of all parties involved.

- $2000.00 for electrified chain-link fence
- $1000.00 for resurfacing and painting the court
- $1000.00 for landscaping around court
- $1000.00 to send one MCB resident and escort to the U.S. Lawn Tennis Association Tournament at Forest Hills (the escort shall be a law student selected by lottery)
- $500.00 for the Grand Tennis Ball to be held in August (money shall be used to pay for a band, fruit punch and carrot sticks)
- $500.00 mailing and printing costs for the newsletter "The Weekly Balls"
- $100.00 for the purchase of graham crackers to be used as positive reinforcement in the program to train local squirrels to retrieve balls
In return for the funds provided by the LS S.S.S., the following court times will be reserved for law students:

9 am to 7 am Monday, Wednesday, Friday
11 pm to 1 am Friday, Saturday, Sunday

The Martha Cook residents reserve the right to ownership of all balls landing outside of the court on MCB property, as well as the right to operate the tennis ball and soft drink concession and the right to remove from the court anyone using foul or obscene language.

Thank you for your kind consideration of our requests.

BASEBALL POLL

It's time for the second annual RG Baseball Poll. The winners will be determined next October, and the sub will be awarded by Ranger Howie Bernstein.

Circle the winners in each division. Then answer the tiebreaker questions.

NL EAST
Chicago
Pittsburgh
Montreal
Philadelphia
St. Louis
New York

AL EAST
Cleveland
New York
Detroit
Baltimore
Milwaukee
Boston

NL WEST
Atlanta
Houston
Cincinnati
San Francisco
Los Angeles
San Diego

AL WEST
Texas
Chicago
Minnesota
California
Oakland
Kansas City

Winner of AL pennant? __________
Winner of NL pennant? __________
Winner of World Series? __________

How many games above or below 100 will the Tigers lose? __________

(Explanations: If you expect the Tigers to lose 103 games, you should insert a three in the space above; if you expect them to lose only 99, a negative one (-1) should be inserted.)

Sincerely,

Jockelyn A. Strapp
Chairperson, Association for Athletic Support, MCB

George A. Pagano