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Gruening sees trouble in America, unresolved by "very bad leadership" in the White House, and caused principally by a Southeast Asian war which is the "longest, bloodiest, costliest and least excusable" one in history. And it was based on lies, Gruening noted while recounting the events leading up to large-scale commitment of U.S. ground troops by Lyndon Johnson. According to that Administration, U.S. destroyers in international waters on peaceful purposes were attacked without reason by North Vietnamese PT boats with torpedoes and machine gun fire, on August 2, 1964 and then again on August 4. Over nation-wide television on the evening of August 4, President Johnson announced that retaliatory strikes had been directed against North Vietnamese PT boat bases, and made known his intention to ask for legislation authorizing any action by the President to secure the "peace and security" of Southeast Asia.

But the story was false, says Gruening, since records show the involved ships, the Maddox and the Turner Joy, were shortly before the Tonkin incident fitted out as spy ships and were apparently in North Vietnamese coastal waters. Furthermore, while

See GRUENING cont'd p. 8

The draft of the following proposal was submitted to R.G. two weeks ago but was inadvertently lost in the shuffle. It includes a valuable suggestion which has not previously been seen in the eternal discussion of the grading system. A mandatory pass-no entry system for at least the first year seems to us a worthwhile possibility and one that should receive consideration in the current debate. The action of the outgoing Student Senate in formalizing such a proposal is a step in that direction.

-- Editors

PASSED BY THE RETIRING STUDENT SENATE
AND SENT TO THE FACULTY

March 23, 1972

To: Dean St. Antoine and Faculty
From: Law School Student Senate

The Law School Student Senate, convinced of the inadequacy of the present grading system and encouraged by the overwhelming support of 716 out of 798 student votes cast in its recent referendum, hereby urges the Faculty to adopt the following grading system:

1) Mandatory pass-no entry for a Student's first 2 terms in Law School, the first 3 terms in the case of summer starters.

2) Optional pass-no entry to be elected in opposition to the present 9-tier grading system such election to be made at the date of registration for each term subsequent to the mandatory period above and such election applying to all courses taken during that term only.
LETTERS:

To the Editors:

Mr. Compton's letter in the April 7 R.G., attacking Prof. Carrington's stand on the grading system, shows a weakness of this institution. Unfortunately, the weakness demonstrated is not that of the grading system (though it is weak) but that of the system which teaches the lawyer or law student to use his skills with the English language, his gift for sarcasm, etc., to destructive ends. Inspect Mr. Compton's letter carefully, if you will. It is a vehicle for personal attack. That portion which purports to be constructive (suggesting a "faculty and student body assembly in brief moratorium") is at best difficult to comprehend (i.e., moratorium of what?). To the extent that the substance suggests mass meetings to solve difficult questions I think it will not bear close scrutiny.

The real point of this letter, however, is the suggestion that less vitriol and more self-control be used in the approach to hard questions. Even when the "opposition" irritates us for its seeming stupidity, insensitivity, etc., the temporarily gratifying poisoned pen generally makes solutions harder to reach, not easier. I doubt that temporary gratification is worth the price.

One need not compare Prof. Carrington with George Wallace to benefit from George McGovern's admonition concerning Wallace: The people who support Wallace need answers to what he says, not condemnation. Professor Carrington, and the rest of us (students and faculty) are no less needful.

/s/ James A. Martin

To the Editors:

Re: the letter Ken Siegel wrote last week.
I understand about Ken Siegel that last year, he somehow politically arranged things so that he was on the Speaker's Committee. The other members turned out to be rather apathetic, so Ken took it upon himself to hire people to speak to the Law School whose qualifications consisted of being in positions where they might later help good ol' Kenny out. Like the Congressman from Escanaba (or wherever out in the woods Ken is from). He had a lot of hot-ticket comments for law students here. Especially if you later would like to work for him in Escanaba. I understand Ken is presently working for him part-time in Escanaba.

I just cannot believe your gall. I ran against Frank Jackson for President of the LSSS and I must admit, I had misgivings about him as President. But as a member at large, I can only say that Frank has amazed me. He is a dynamic, aggressive, tireless, selfless person who is concerned only with the welfare of all the law students. I must admit, he is probably a better President than I would have been had I won. I really didn't realize there were still people around who would work so diligently and, yes, humbly, once elected to represent the student body. I am rather shocked at your wild-eyed allegations in view of all that Frank has accomplished. And they are only allegations, Ken. There was little substance in fact for what you said. The truth is, no one on the LSSS wanted to further your personal goals at the expense of the student body.

You see, Ken, as a member of the speaker committee, you were supposed to contact people the student body would be interested in, not further your own personal interests. We're not all as provincial as you either are or think we are.

/s/ Tom Carhart

December '72 and May and August '73 grads: If you plan to interview you should prepare your resume over the summer. Submission deadline at the Placement Office is Sept. 20. A hand-out on resume preparation is available at the Placement Office.

May and August '72 grads: If you have definite plans for after graduation, you should report this information to the Placement Office.
To the Editors:

Last week it was decided that Mr. Tran Van Dinh's appearance at this law school should be postponed until next fall. As President of the LSSS, it was my unpleasant duty to inform Mr. Dinh of this decision. The reasons are as follows.

We had no notice of him coming until the weekend before he was to speak. Mr. Dinh was to speak on a Saturday. This is an inherently bad day to speak. Outside of Club residents, few law students are ever around on the weekend. Many Quad residents leave for the weekend. For the most part, those who stay were making a last ditch effort to catch up, since it was only four weeks to finals.

Coupled with these considerations, we were reminded that Frank Wilkinson, our speaker of March 31st had an audience of less than 12 people. This was quite embarrassing. We had only one week's publicity for Mr. Wilkinson, who incidently was an excellent speaker, because he had agreed to speak on short notice.

Since Mr. Dinh was asked to speak by the Speakers Committee and not by the LSSS and since it is normally the Speakers Committee's responsibility to deal with speakers, I consulted as many members of the Speakers Committee as I could reach in that short period of time. I also consulted several members of the Senate. I talked to Pamela Stuart, Vice President of the Senate, Jim Plummer, Treasurer of the Senate, Harry Blackmond, co-chairman of the Speakers Committee and a Senate member, and Rob Kuhbach, last year President of the LSSS.

Jeff Petrash, former chairman of the Speakers Committee was also consulted. Each of the above suggested that we postpone Mr. Dinh's visit. Sally Rutzky, co-chairman of the Speakers Committee and Senate member and

James Bradley, member of the Speakers Committee were informed of the decision after it was acted upon and agreed that it was the best choice.

As it was we had to choose the least of all possible evils. On the one hand, we could allow Mr. Dinh to speak to as small a group as 10 people. There was also the possibility that no law student would show. On the other hand, we could postpone his talk, extend our apologies and promise a speaking engagement in the fall.

There are arguments on both sides. Based on our collective experience and individual views, we chose the latter. I do not now think as I did not then think that the path chosen was without merit.

As for the honorarium, I felt that because of the late cancellation date, we had a moral and quite possibly legal obligation to honor the promised $200.

The decision was a hard one. I stand by it, not in the knowledge of having made an absolutely correct decision, but in the belief that I need not be ashamed of my actions.

/s/ Frank Jackson

LETTERS AGAIN cont'd from p.4

secret? Yes, fans, it is happening. Of course, they can't tell us the reason for holding the closed meeting, it is a secret. Shhhhh, maybe they are meeting right now.

Yours for open covenants, openly arrived at,

John Watts
LETTERS cont'd from p.2

April 5, 1972

To the Editors:

Here is a proposal for changing the curriculum at the law school. It is incomplete and needs input from other people, but I believe the idea is basically sound. Its purpose is to 1) allow students a better opportunity for concentrated study by reducing the number of courses which they carry at any one time, 2) permit more time for special research, work on journals, clinical law, legal aid, outside interests, etc., 3) develop better legal writing, and 4) make interdisciplinary studies more feasible.

The revamped curriculum centers around six eight-week terms during each calendar year. Completion of four out of six terms would mean that a student had finished the equivalent of one year's study. Students wishing to accelerate would enroll in more than four terms. The additional four weeks in the calendar year could be used to schedule around holidays and exams.

During an eight week term, a student would carry two three-credit courses. Each course would meet five times a week for one hour and ten minutes—like the three-credit eight week courses currently do during the summer. After three years of four terms a year, a student would have accrued 72 hours credit. If the law curriculum is going to be reduced from 81 hours, as some people are suggesting, 72 would be just about on target. If not, the remaining nine credits could be acquired over the three year period by taking a couple of seminars, doing a research project, in some clinical law/legal aid for credit type program, or some combination thereof.

Aside from a general dissatisfaction with the general curriculum, this proposal assumes several things. First, it is based on the belief that students learn better if their efforts are concentrated on fewer subjects at one time. Secondly, nothing is gained during the three or four off days when a particular course is not meeting. Third, daily preparation of two courses time would be used judiciously.

Fourth, professors would find that this system is more flexible and leaves them more time for personal research and outside interests. Finally, the proposed curriculum would not be more difficult and costly to administer. Perhaps all of these assumptions are mistaken, but they and the plan should be examined. I don't believe it presents any insurmountable problems.

I have mentioned it to the Dean and he said he would pass it on to the Curriculum Committee. Deciding to take advantage of R.G.'s key role as purveyor of ideas, I thought the entire law school community might toss the idea around. Perhaps someone could expand on it and something good for us all would result.

Hopefully,
/s/ dave mikelonis

Dear Editors:

Re: Sis column

As a future women law student at Michigan, I am worried by the oversensitivity I have noticed in your column. Your recent criticism of a professor for including a case involving Tampax Corporation was ridiculous. I would have been offended had the case been omitted or had the professor renamed it to protect delicate eyes and ears. Tampax is a product we all know that women use, it is part of the economic world, and it is refreshing to have men take such things for granted rather than make jokes or become embarrassed about them.

/s/ Social work student

Dear Mr. Editor:

Shades of ITT and the U.S. Senate! I understand the Law School Student Senate plans to hold an "executive" (CLOSED) meeting on Thursday night (April 13). What item of national security will be on the agenda? What do they have to hide? Our elected representatives meeting in
A lean, tall, tanned Californian walked across the plaza of Boalt Hall Law School. The sun was shining. Everywhere there were girls, and women, and he said, "Suddenly, I feel very out of place." He was.

The National Conference for Women and the Law had determined men would not be permitted to attend (likewise, no formal press). But, more so, he was out of place because this conference, the weekend of March 31st through April 2nd, created an atmosphere in which law was for women, HUNDREDS of women (law students, lawyers, para-professionals, potential law students, female children both having their "consciences raised" and raising some consciences).

The men studying in the library, dining in the cafeteria, lounging under the blue sky were what women have been for so long -- oddities. This conference devoted itself to the concrete problems that have resulted from the viewpoint that to focus on the topic "Women and the Law" is odd. The problem developing a device to teach empathy seems to have been partially solved. The presence of a Women and the Law Conference on a campus is an effective teaching device. Therefore, the Midwestern caucus has chosen to accept our school's invitation to have the regional women and the law conference here during October 6, 7, 8 of 1972. Our law school community should begin to think about what our conference should be.

The Boalt Hall conference consulted people traditionally thought to be separate from the law school community. Thus, undergraduates, graduate students, social workers, mothers in the Bay Area, High School students, as well as law students throughout the country, were asked what this conference should include. The consensus was that technical law should not be emphasized. Rather, the conference should breach the gaps between those women trained by the legal profession and those to whom law seems to hinder and not to help. Consequently, there were workshops entitled, Lesbian Rights; Abortion; Girls' Rights; Legal Rights of Women with Children; Illegitimacy, Motherhood, and Welfare: Taste, Class and Race; Third World Women and Feminism; The Chicana and the Law; Southeastern (of the U.S.) Women; Clinical Programs and Divorce Counseling; Recruitment and Admissions; Organizing the Women's Community to Participate in a Hearing or Trial; Child Care Centers; Employment; Women in Prison; Women with Children; Welfare Rights; Prostitution; Rape -- just to cite a few.

Though the emphasis of the conference was not technical, some of the workshops included discussion of legal and political tactics to change the application of law. For instance, we discussed legal arguments with respect to abortion, strategy for obtaining equal employment opportunities, statutory construction of various states' juvenile law so that a double standard can be eliminated where grossly unjustified, modes to expand workers' protective legislation and extend it to men as well as women. Because there was nationwide representation, at seemingly every workshop we could profit from the comparative law approach.

Many law students were enthusiastic at the suggestion made by Barbara Rheinstein, graduate of Boalt Hall, at the discussion to evaluate the conference, that in the near future we have conferences on specific topics, as Equal Employment Opportunity Law, to supplement and for the most part substitute for the unfortunate deficiency of many law school curriculums. Not all, however, were supportive of this suggestion. There was a contingent that felt that national or regional conferences should be devoted to sensitizing and dialogue between the profession and the lay people. Others wanted to eradicate the use of the word "profession," emphasizing that that is a white male concept, and wanted to institute the use of a sisterhood model. Use of the sisterhood model would mean to those who advanced the idea that technical learning should go on in the law school, so that the foundation could be used for further education, communication goals at the major conferences. Nonetheless, my impression was that the majority, if not willing to support specific topic conferences, desires that national and regional conferences include "tooling up" sessions. See WOMEN'S cont'd p.6.
Regulations:

a) A "pass" grade will be determined upon whether or not a student achieves what the professor considers to be a minimum level of performance (thus it is possible that everyone or no one might "pass" a course).

b) If a student does not pass a course, no entry will be made on his transcript, he will receive no course credit toward graduation, and he will be allowed to take the course again if he so desires.

c) An election for pass-no entry grading will apply to all courses taken in any one term. Thus a student cannot take some courses for traditional grades and others pass-no entry in any one term. However, a student can change his election from term to term so that one term he might receive letter grades while receiving pass-no entry the next term.

d) The Faculty will make greater use of the opportunity which it now has to comment on the work of exceptional students.

e) Any honors or awards presently based on grades or grade points will be made on the basis of Faculty recommendations and, where appropriate, as in the case of Law Review, on the basis of writing samples.

The Senate feels that the subject of changing the grading system has been discussed long enough. We realize that grading reform has been a topic of discussion for several years on the Academic Standards and Incentives Committee. But while the talk has continued, cheating on exams increases, unhealthy degrees of pressure to "get that A" mount, books disappear from the library, the "lower half" of a graduating class experiences difficulty in finding jobs even though the Dean has asserted that these students are as competent or nearly so as the "upper half."

The time for change is now. Eliminate the pressure for grades so that learning again becomes the primary value of law students. Eliminate the lower graduates can obtain jobs.

The Senate's proposed grading reform accomplishes these objectives. Absence of grades in the first year removes the pressure of grades at a time when students should be most concerned with the law. When students have experienced law school for one year, they will then be capable of making a knowledgeable decision on the form of grading they prefer. With an understanding of what law school is all about, they can then set and pursue their own goals by whatever means they feel best.

Many systems of grade reform are possible. No system will be perfect. But the Senate feels its system is in the best interests of the students. The Law School Student Senate therefore urges the Faculty to adopt this recommendation.

Our Women Law Students' office, room 116 of the library, now has materials culled from various law schools to provide ideas for recruitment, for achieving equal employment opportunities, challenging abortion laws, for challenging discriminatory enforcement of criminal laws, and for designing our October conference. We have names of schools that are aching to admit women. Have you suggested to inquiring women that they apply to Valparaiso, Notre Dame, or Cleveland State Law School?

There was discussion about the wisdom of having another national conference next year since national planning has not resulted from the first three. The decision to have another was made when the representatives from the University of South Carolina Law School (which will have completed the construction of its new complex in 1973) informed the conference that the Dean of their school is anxious to extend the law school's invitation to all of "those lawyer ladies." Motion passed by acclamation. All knew we all had to get down to South Carolina!

-- Janice Siegel

[Postscript on the Midwestern Conference to be held here in October -- It will be open to all.]
"Sunnyside" is the euphemism for a neighborhood on the outskirts of Adrian, about 40 miles southwest of here. Sunnyside's people are Chicanos, mainly migrant farmers, and their living conditions are reportedly quite poor.

Two years ago, Ruminant Nitrogen Products opened a plant next to Sunnyside. The people complained to the local health and fire departments about ammonia fumes from the plant, the possibility of explosion, and the danger of trucks carrying ammonia through their neighborhood. There were meetings of people from Sunnyside, the county health department, the Community Action Center and the plant, at which it was brought out that some of the fumes were probably caused by Ruminant leaving hoses uncapped on its tank trucks or by some other "negligence" in connecting and disconnecting the tubing. (Workers who do this must wear gas masks. The people a few yards away in Sunnyside do not feel they should have to.) It was suggested by Ruminant's owner that some of the other nearby chemical plants might be adding to the problem.

Eventually the health department notified the Air Pollution Control Commission (of the Michigan Department of Public Health) of the situation. Dan Meyer, from this agency, has been coming to Adrian to investigate. In trying to track down all pollutants involved, he has found 4 other plants that might be contributing. As yet it is uncertain "what came from where", so stock samplings of all the plants are being made.

The state agency will recommend pollution control equipment when results of the tests are known. Meyer says that Ruminant will "have to" have such equipment before it reopens in June (operations run from June to October) and its owner has promised to install it.

Meanwhile, the people of Sunnyside began to organize a group called Concerned Chicanos. On March 31, they held an open meeting with the Adrian City Commission, a representative from the county health department and Meyer. They presented a petition calling for Ruminant's relocation, new city anti-pollution laws, and the placing of industrial plants at least 2 miles from residential areas. The City Commission has done nothing about the "Sunnyside problem" and explained that there is, and will be, no pollution ordinance because there is no laboratory or technical staff to enforce it; the state laws and facilities will better take care of such things. However, control over industrial location is up to local zoning authorities. (Ruminant is in an industrial zone, as is all of Sunnyside.) The City Commission said there was no way to rezone so as to force the plant out, and it told the people that essentially it was passing the whole buck up to the state (with good reason, says Meyer). Meyer says that all the plants involved have been "very cooperative" so far and he believes the emissions can and will be controlled. He is apparently quite concerned and helpful. ELS is in touch with him and will be kept informed.

However, the high level of tension and "lack of communication" among all groups evident at the meeting indicated that the difficulty in Adrian is, as one would expect, much deeper than simply the air pollution. It seemed that the Sun-
the U.S. ships were patrolling the Gulf area, South Vietnamese gunships were raiding installations along the North Vietnamese coast, and presumably the North Vietnamese assumed the destroyers near-by were support vessels and liable to attack under the "rules of war." Most damning was the revelation four years later by Senator William Fulbright of a telegram sent from authorities on the Maddox that stated in part the "review of action shows contacts and torpedo sightings doubtful" and due to over-eager radar operators and lookouts on board. It was recommended that no action be taken until later after more study. But Johnson went ahead, and concealed the telegram's message of delay from Congressional leaders before the August 4 speech. In short, declares Gruening, after this fraudulent beginning the war has been shown to be one in which "no good whatever has come, or will come." Yet it continues under Richard Nixon, who promised to end it but 30 months later finally revealed his plan for the war which actually served to perpetuate it.

And there's other trouble, Gruening continued, with serious assaults on Constitutional rights, chiefly from an ever-widening wire-tapping effort, and extensive dossier files on "subversive."

And then there were the incredibly bad Supreme Court nominations, the rejection of which, Gruening says, caused Nixon to go out and hole up on his yacht for a weekend and come back to deliver one of the most severe denunciations of the Senate in history.

And there's the Vice-President, who was sent by the Administration last year "to fascist Spain in order to congratulate Franco on 25 years of tryanny." In Gruening's words, Spiro Agnew is simply a "hatcher of hate, a vendor of venom, and a deviser of devisiveness," the Alaskan noting he, too, could do those alliterative lines.

Concluding his address, Gruening urged that each person had a responsibility to re-vitalize our democracy despite all the trouble he had recounted previously. Disliking the sight of youthful cynicism and apathy after instead for young people to recognize that democracy "carries within it the seeds of its own regeneration" through political action.

When asked why he had voted no on the Tonkin resolution, Gruening replied that he had no knowledge of the falsity of the attack reports, but had made up his mind several years before that we shouldn't be in Vietnam. He had even delivered a speech in the Senate several months before the Tonkin Resolution came up entitled "Why We Should Get Out of Vietnam."

As for the Alaska pipeline, Gruening thought that the real problem for the environment was the possibility of huge oil spills at the southern end of the line, rather than along the interior right-of-way because there the pipe would be to Alaska as a piece of string would be to an 18 hole golf course. He couldn't see why the technology empire that sent people to the moon could not build leak-proof pipes.

In response to another question, Gruening said his choice for Democratic Presidential nominee would be George McGovern since he had the best qualifications and has laid his cards on the table for the American people. McGovern has let everybody know where he stands, and concerning proposals for change, is the only candidate to say where the money will come from, according to the former Senator.

By length and volume of the applause at the end of the lecture, it was apparent most listeners were glad to have heard in person someone who was "present at the creation" of resistance to the Asian war.

-- M.G.S.

ATTENTION HUSBANDS!

Finals are coming -- atone now for your behavior in the weeks ahead. Remind you wife of the Spring Luncheon and Fashion Show. It is Saturday, April 22, 12 noon at the RUBAIYAT with clothes by the BAGPIPER. Tickets are $3.50; available from Pat Colombo at 971-7080 or from Betty Williams at 971-6374.

-- sponsored by Law Wives Ass'n
Journal News

The American Bar Foundation is currently considering funding a research project proposed by the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform. The study is an effort to test the assertion made in Williams v. Florida, 398 U.S. 78 (1970), that the reduction in jury size to six members would not significantly affect the purposes to be served by the jury system. Several commentators have pointed out that the Supreme Court's assertion was not based on any empirical evidence. The study, therefore, will supply the information that was unavailable when Williams was decided. Several members of the Journal staff have been involved in the project, and there will be an opportunity for some members of next year's junior staff to work on the project and help prepare an article describing the results of the study.

The study will be composed of two analyses of empirically obtained data. The first analysis involves records of civil cases tried before twelve and six-man juries in the Wayne County Circuit Court. The second analysis is an experiment using juries of six and twelve members who will observe a taped trial. Experimenters will study the deliberations of these groups, examining not only the results of the deliberations, but also the techniques and content of deliberations, in order to determine whether the smaller groups interact in ways significantly different from the larger groups.

Although the Journal has only recently submitted its proposal to the American Bar Foundation, much progress in the study has already been accomplished. On March 24, 1972, the simulated trial to be used in the jury experiment of the study was taped. Through the invaluable cooperation of Edward Stein, visiting lecturer in trial practice, a simulated trial was held in the moot court room. The plaintiff and defendant who appeared were involved in a dispute growing out of an actual automobile accident. The actual case had been previously settled out of court. Jeff Froehlich and Bruce Chadwick, two students in the trial practice course, acted as attorneys, and Mr. Stein served as the judge.

The Journal is encouraged by the progress which has been so far and looks forward to a favorable response from the American Bar Foundation. The experiment will continue through next fall, thus affording members of next year's staff an opportunity to become involved in the preparation of a report on the project which will be published in the Journal.

FALL cont'd from p.7

ny side people were raising this issue as just one of the more pressing instances of "oppression" -- which is probably substantial, if Sunnyside is at all typical of a poor Chicano community. Even if the Adrian City Commission is not in a position to deal effectively with pollution, it is hoped they will see that Sunnyside's problems extend much further than the immediate complaint.

-Mary Richman

ATTENTION ALL LEGAL AID VOLUNTEERS:

Ira Meyer would like to have a meeting with all students presently handling cases to discuss what to do with your cases when you leave for the summer, and suggestions you have for changes in procedure, etc. The meeting is Wednesday night (April 19) at 7:30 p.m. at the Ann Arbor Clinic. Please come!

The Black Law Students Alliance announces the election of officers for the 1972-73 year:

CHAIRMAN: GAIL POWELL '73
VICE CHAIRMAN: KEN MAYFIELD '74
RECORDING SECRETARY: HERB BOOKER '74
CORRESPONDING SECRETARY: MICHELLE COLEMAN '74
TREASURER: CARL BRYSON '74
WASHINGTON(RG) - In a hastily called news conference today, Presidential Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler termed the fall of Saigon hours before, "just as one battle, not the whole war." Ziegler pointed out that this was the first time the Viet Cong had assumed administration of a major city, a fact he said promised to seriously hamper the enemy's ability to fight elsewhere. Ziegler, however, had no comment on reports that several battalions of Army engineers from Fort Buford, Arkansas were being flown to Southeast Asia in order to supervise the construction of an off-shore island accomodating the government of General Thieu.

PEASBARK, KANSAS(RG) - Appearing before a home-state crowd of Rotarians yesterday, Senator Robert Dole escalated his recent attacks on Democratic Party Convention arrangements by charging that exclusive vendor permits were granted to Girl Scout Troop 42 in exchange for certain favors in the group's sale of ice cream products around the Miami convention site. Dole said he had a memorandum written by eleven year old Troop treasurer Sally Bingham intimating that big Democratic Party contributors attending as delegates would be offered their choice of 2 fudge bars or an orange creamy delight absolutely free following the satisfactory outcome of the permit deal.

WASHINGTON(RG) - The Pentagon today released figures which show that the United States and the Soviet Union are in virtual parity regarding overall military strength. However, Defense chief Melvin Laird emphasized these were broad, general statistics, in an apparent move to assuage fears of members of Congress concerned about national security. He noted that although both sides had approximately equal numbers of missiles, bombers, and submarines, the U.S. had retained overwhelming superiority in the number of generals and admirals, ready reserves of staff aircraft and vehicles, and deployment of strategic military bases in every state.

ELS-ILS

On Thursday, April 20, the Environmental Law Society and the International Law Society will hold a joint "dinner meeting" in the Lawyers Club faculty dining room at 6:00 pm. Mr. Michael J. Matheson, an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of Legal Adviser, U.S. Department of State, will be our guest speaker. His topic will be: "Preparations for the Stockholm Conference on the World Environment: International Environmental Law." If you want to attend the dinner, please sign the list outside room 100 HH. An informal discussion with Mr. Matheson will be held in room 132 HH at 7:00 p.m.

Hear a good WASP joke, Bill?

Law Intern Program

There are six openings in the Law Intern Program (three in the Prosecutor's Office and three as judicial clerks). Students are expected to work full time during the summer and 10-20 hours per week during the next school year. The duties are similar to those required of a law office clerk. The salary is $2.70/hr. Applications may be obtained in Room 300, Hutchins Hall. Application Deadline: Friday, April 21.