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BOB HARRIS SUPERSTAR
UNIV. OF MICH.

Mayor Harris, sometimes known as Professor Harris of the Law School, consented to this interview last Tuesday afternoon at City Hall. It came at a particularly inopportune time for the mayor, who had precious little time to give to an interview between appointments and phone calls.

RG: Mayor Harris — Professor Harris — on the assumption that your constituents at the Law School know as little about your Vietnam trip as anyone else, could you give us a little background about it? I have the Detroit Free Press from last Thursday /4/20/ which says, "Robert J. Harris, Mayor of Ann Arbor, and about 20 others have signed a statement agreeing to go to Hanoi and Haiphong May 15 'to declare ourselves peace hostages to protect Vietnamese citizens and American prisoners of war from American bombings.' Was this a spur-of-the-moment sort of thing, or was it well-planned?

HARRIS: The idea did not originate with me. A group of people was discussing all the possible measures that American citizens could take. This was when the President retaliated with the bombing raid on Hanoi and Haiphong, you recall, after the North Vietnamese offensive had picked up. And I think a lot of people were tremendously concerned, both at the general escalation of the war and at the likelihood of a large loss of civilian life from bombing urbanized centers. I got a call from Peter Darrow, who is an attorney here in town, mentioning that they had thought the thing through reasonably well, the lot of them who had got the idea, and asking if I would join them. I indicated I

RANSFORD RESIGNS

Ann Ransford, law school Placement Director, admits that she has violated her own best advice to law students: "I quit but I have no idea what kind of job I'll find. I'm just going to go to Washington, D.C. this summer and pound the pavement until I find a job."

Actually, Ms. Ransford's resignation was not so precipitous as it seems nor her prospects so uncertain. She has many contacts in the Capitol and expects their assistance in her job search. Her decision to resign was formulated last year but followed only now "because now it's mechanically feasible for me to leave. Myrna [Sorkin, Miss Ransford's assistant] is here and she knows the ropes pretty well, so someone will be able to smooth the transition."

Ms. Ransford credited being "tired with the routine" as a major consideration in her decision to leave the office. "This job," she observed, "is like the Admissions Office in the sense that, after maybe three or four years there or five or six years here, you've heard all the questions and you find yourself giving the same answers. I've been here six years and I'm ready for something new."

The Placement Director flatly denied rumors that her leaving was precipitated by discontent with the placement picture at Michigan, although a usually reliable source indicated that she was frustrated by the seemingly irreconcilable wishes of various groups of students and of employers. (See the following article on placement trends in the past year).

Dean St. Antoine seemed to respond to this concern when he commented: "Sometimes students don't fully appreciate the extent to which Ann has truly
I don't know which is more appalling - the crassness of some of my fellow students in their response to last week's antiwar petition or my naivete in expecting something more intelligent and decent. If it's the latter, we had better either take a good hard look at what we're doing here or else just give up and stop wasting our time in such futile "idealism".

The petition called for a U.S. withdrawal from Indochina, most strongly condemning the "new" air offensive, and for a cancelation of classes last Friday as part of a nationwide show of student opposition to Nixon's war policies. The small number of signatures was shocking. It's still hard for me to believe that a sizable number of law students either approve of the murder in Southeast Asia or (to be more charitable) are so hung up and obsessed by exams and grades that they don't want to do anything that might "run them the risk" of rescheduling a couple of classes and slightly messing up their intricate study schedule. God damn it, people, where are your priorities? Anyway, that wasn't what I was planning to write about. I have enough misgivings about those of us who, for whatever reason, didn't want their names on record condemning this atrocious war. But what about those who tore up the petitions or defaced them by writing silly cracks or statements supporting Nixon? There's not much to say about signing Donald Duck on a serious petition or tearing it up except that it's hopelessly rude and immature. Much worse were the comments to the effect that the signer "fully supported the President". Some of these people defended their statements by saying that they were merely exercising their First Amendment freedom of expression and that I, as a civil libertarian, should support their actions. Even though I haven't done any extensive study of freedom of expression, I think they're very wrong. There are obviously some things that have to be gotten straight about this as a matter of common sense and morality rather than legal theory. "Freedom of expression" doesn't seem to extend to an unnecessary interference with someone else's First Amendment rights at least not without justification. I can certainly condone "disruptive" modes of "speech" if there is no equally effective "non-disruptive" means. But where there clearly exist easily accessible channels of expression which interfere with no one else, the use of tactics such as fouling up a petition with which one doesn't agree seems to be motivated more by a desire to destroy than merely to speak. Thus, the people involved might be able to persuade me that they were acting from something more than sheer malice if there were no way for them to circulate their own petition or otherwise make their views known, or if they had made the slightest attempt at doing so. As it is, students supporting the war had the same opportunities to let people know it as did those whose petition they defaced. But it apparently didn't occur to them to use these opportunities or to express their ideas in any way whatsoever until they had that petition in front of them. Sorry, that's not a convincing show of good faith free speech.

This isn't a matter of legal rights but of common decency. If these people had initiated their own petition, it would never have occurred to me to touch it. That's stooping pretty damn low.

There is no excuse.

Mary Richman

Dear R.G.,

I'd like to comment on what seems to me to be the misconception of some faculty members about student motives for wanting to adopt a pass-fail grading system.

I don't think, as Prof. Carrington has suggested, that the primary motive for the change is to make good jobs easier to come by. I don't even think that most students think of their position in the job market as a valid motive for changing the grading system. The recent student poll supports this point as its indication that students with high grades were just as opposed to the present system as students with low grades.

Students favor pass-fail grading because they think it is better educationally for them. They are no longer interested, if they ever were, in competing with their classmates for grades and faculty recognition. Most have long since shed the
NOTES TOWARD A DEFINITION OF COME-UPPANCE

Well, you thought you'd never make it all the way through. Did you? Or are you actually buried in the remains of your personhood, shattered from the unending blows of the law machine? It may take you yet another month to make it all the way through to the top of the heap so you can breathe again. But then you'll wonder why you let yourself get buried in the first place.

Think about it. Next year sling back a few arrows at your outrageous fortune -- it can't hurt at least the half of us who get those C's. Be surly when you're badgered once too often; ask in class why you aren't covering a particular relevant topic; return The Man's mind-numbing verbal tics now and again when you recite, with just the right flick of the tongue. Sure you're plummeting to The Man's level of decency for a few moments, but it feels so good to get your soul out of escrow.

Certainly the Dean will squeak back when you squeeze him that it's unfortunate so-and-so "has trouble in the classroom, but he's a good scholar." One can find a perverse academic political logic to having Names around, creating institutional rewards in which we all eventually share. But at what personal cost? If the ABA succeeds in screening out those law school applicants who have a personality and some principles, the last class still having the sense to stop cowering may now be passing away without a sound.

-- M.G.S.

"You're too late -- I dug up a surefire gameplan on my own."

ABA PROPOSAL

In the discussion of the ABA proposal for law school character and fitness exam, two questions have been constantly confused. The first question is what should be done about the character exams. The second question is what should be done, if anything, about the increasing number of law students and lawyers. Both the Res Gestae last week and the ABA Committee are confused on these questions.

The ABA Committee report under fire is directed solely to the question of where and when character and fitness exams for the state bar should be given. The report essentially recommends that the exam should be given before or during law school, instead of after graduation. The committee justifies the recommendation by stating that the new procedure would save everybody's time and effort by letting a student know before three years have gone that he is wasting his time.

Starting with the proviso that the character exams are desirable or necessary, the ABA proposal might make sense. Upon a little close examination though, the logic collapses. The proposing committee presents no data on how many bar applicants presently fail the bar because of the character test. This is presumably a small number. In light of the "chilling effect" that was correctly pointed out last week, what is the real point in moving up the character test just to save the time of a very few students?

The real fireworks in the whole issue start to explode when the second question is brought up: should the size of the legal profession be artificially limited? The ABA Committee starts the discussion of the character exam proposal with a recitation of a few figures about the dramatic increase in law school enrollment. While the figures are cited to illustrate the difficulty of administering the new proposal, it is difficult not to come to the uncomfortable conclusion that such a test would be a means of limiting
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grade-school mentality. Most students come to Law School because they want to learn about law, not because they want to assure themselves of prestigious, remunerative, or comfortable careers.

I've been puzzled ever since I came here over the generally poor quality of the teaching. Perhaps it's because the teachers think their students are only interested in getting good jobs. If teachers don't have any respect for their students, how can they teach them in an effective, stimulating way? If you treat people like third-graders or assume that they have no intellectual curiosity, what effect does this have on them?

I think that the desire for pass-fail grading is to a large extent motivated by discontent with the quality of law school teaching and law school education. I hope that the faculty recognizes this.

/s/ Tom Lichten

Dear Editor:

Passing by the "Big Sis" bulletin board, I noticed someone wrote on it "FEMALE CHAUVINIST." Undoubtedly, it was prompted by a sense of malicious humor. But like much humor, it is the grain of truth behind the comment that invokes the smile.

Suffering under the stinging bitter barbs and labels like "Pig," it hadn't occurred to me that the loudest defenders of Women's Lib are guilty of the very same conduct they condemn most in men.

Now there is nothing inherently wrong with being a female chauvinist. Surely there is as much constitutional right to be a female chauvinist as to be a male one. And just as surely, given the legitimate claims of females, a loud aggressive voice might be a way to achieve their goals.

To refuse to recognize their own conduct for what it is, however, smacks of hypocrisy. It's like donning the pure white cloak of moral superiority without taking a bath.

/s/ A spokesman for truth in advertising,

Mike Dawson

Re: "Anon.'s" letter on smoking

The following letter appeared recently in the student newspaper at the University of S. Dakota. I thought RG's readers and especially those who concur with Anon.'s complaint, might enjoy the apt metaphorical imagery with which the writer depicts the discomfort caused by smokers.

/s/Dan Berger

To the editor:

There is a matter I'd like to air. As a matter of fact, that's the subject—air.

I was always taught that "passing gas" was a social evil, neither practiced in nor condoned by polite society. Even if the prospective "passer" had to bear some discomfort, that was preferred to the alternative. And I'd be willing to accept the premise that most college students today have been brought up in the same way. Why is it, then, that in many of the (especially the inadequately ventilated) classrooms here at USD, some thoughtless individuals will force their exhalation of exhaust on the unwilling nostrils of their fellow students?

I think it was Mark Twain (but I'm not sure) who once said, "Other people's rights end where my nose begins!" The context in which that statement was made probably differed slightly from this one, but the point is still valid. Picture, if you will, sitting in a classroom, breathing in the (relatively, to be sure) fresh air, when the student next to you "fres up." Naturally, you're downwind of him. (It seems like our ALWAYS downwind from these people!) What do you do? Get up and move? No. Ask him to stop? Not usually, although some do. Chances are that you just sit there and go on breathing like everyone else. Maybe you cough a little as your eyes water. Perhaps, if it has occurred to you, you inhale through the sleeve of your shirt or blouse.

In any case, you can't escape.

Note the change in attitude that has taken place. Now, YOU are forced to bear the discomfort so that the polluter can freely exercise his "rights." Forgive me, but that's what license is for 45 or 50 minutes really so long? Aren't the 10 to 15 minutes between classes ample time for one to step outside or out in the hall to relieve himself? (By the way, girls, don't be misled by my use of the editorial masculine pronouns. You're included, too.)

Since everyone agrees with me so far, I wonder if you would do a favor for a lot of people—and maybe yourselves while you're about it. Just consider what I've said when you next find yourself in a congested classroom (or other place) and feel the urge to smoke.

Lewis S. Stone
Graduate Student. Psychology
[As if in affirmation that the muse survives any intellectual hardship, we received this week the following poetic offerings. The authors are law students. -- Eds.]

I know that this life,
Missing its ripeness in love,
IS NOT ALTOGETHER LOST.
I know that the flowers
That fade in the dawn,
The streams that strayed
in the desert
ARE NOT ALTOGETHER LOST.
I know that whatever
Lags behind this life
Laden with slowness
IS NOT ALTOGETHER LOST.
I know that my dreams
That are still unfulfilled,
And my melodies still unstrung,
Are clinging to some blues guitar
And they
ARE NOT ALTOGETHER LOST

When I arose
my night of excess will be ended.
The sunrise will touch my heart
And my voyage will begin
in its orbit of triumphant suffering.
I shall bare my courage, sensitivity, & stamina
against the winces hurled at the oppressed poor & unwanted
And this LIFE
WON'T BE ALTOGETHER LOST.

Scattered in this room,
Dumb, deaf things intermingling
Some strike my eyes, others I barely see;
The corner flower, there,
There the teapot darkly hides its face;
The cabinet articles, miscellaneous,
All crowd in nothingness;
Two window naps lie broken there behind the screen,
Suddenly, I see the red screen itself;
I see but do not see.
And the morning light traces intricate rug designs.
There—thirteen desk cloths; I have fancied it before,
Its color flaring in my eyes.
Today the windows lift, rent as if ashes smoked,
nd it is there, but it is gone.
The drawers are here, layers crammed with papers
I forgot to throw away.
The calendar-staining on the table
Reminds me it is the eleventh day of the month.
The clock ticks; I hardly look.
Near the wall
A brick-room shelf filled with books—
Most of them remain unknown.
Those pictures which I have
Annex like ghosts, forgotten.
The carpet lines once spoke a clear language,
How are almost silent.
Those days gone and this day new
Lie unconnected.
In this small room
Some things are intimate, so many are alien.
And in naivete the table
From operational habit
I miss most of what there is to see.
In attentively, I cross and recross
Between the known and the unknown.
Some one has placed a childhood photograph
Under the mirror-frame; the faded print
Is little more than a shadow.
In my mind I am Allen
Like this room.
In dim, torn language,
Some things there as clear, some
Hide away in corners.
Most of if I merely forgot to move.
Like these list meanings,
The past days diminish,
Rubbing off their right to be.
Shadows lost amidst the new.
And the alphabet which holds their meanings,
But nobody can read.

ALLEN E. CILES

Epilogue

I sit in this class
Just one of a steady audience,
Buying the same ticket
And taking the same seat day upon day.
For three years we are the patrons
Of this theatre -- magnificent gothic stone,
Brass window frames, copper door handles,
Steak lawn chairs, Japanese magnolias,
Fleethful ivy -- sustained mostly by its
own innanity. Yet still we get to choose
Those actors (no accesses yet) we prefer
to hear reading the ancient scriptures.
Then we watch, in fear, in spite, in awe,
or with disdain, and all the while hobnobbing
With our fellows and ladies
Poking fun at ourselves who were once
Intelligent and curious,
But who now can only play out every scene,
act after act,
With a master diligence,
Silently waiting
For Justice to appear, to enter from the wings
And grace the stage
To deliver the ultimate soliloquy
Weaving humanity and freedom
Through our torn fabric called society.
But the dimness of these rooms
Of our minds, (some books are still candles)
This shadow beyond these high-vaulted ceilings
And old wooden desks
Knows nothing of this Justice incandescent.
Even our dreams have been corrupted.
Polite applause, law school is over.
Foolish games, foolish lessons.
All of us, fools. (save the Japanese magnolias.)

-- attributed to
The Visigoth
would. The essential outline of it was that we would go on a rotation schedule so that each of us would be there only two weeks. There would always be a "knot" of us, there wouldn't be an isolated person.

The effort would be to recruit more people in our group, and to try to get prominent people in the group, and the earliest, probably, that the arrangements could be made would be mid- or late-May, with the obvious problems of working out the financing, getting permission from the North Vietnamese before getting into the country at all.

RG: Is the itinerary set yet for your trip?

HARRIS: Very few details. Phil Converse is head of the steering committee. He may know more than I, but I think at the moment the steering committee really is working on a lot of details, on where we'd go, and how to get more people.

RG: This group, I take it, is pretty much locally oriented?

HARRIS: The nucleus of it is. They've got some people from outside the city. There's some effort to get national figures in — how well that's proceeding, I don't know. I mean I hear some things, but I'm not sure if what I hear is official.

RG: What capacity do you go in? Do you go as Mayor Harris of Ann Arbor, or Professor Harris of the Law School, or Citizen Harris?

HARRIS: I suppose I go as Citizen Harris, but I assume that you get some PR by virtue of any offices that you hold. But obviously I'm not going as a representative of the City of Ann Arbor, with the City Council paying my expenses.

RG: Is the press going?

HARRIS: We didn't discuss that. I haven't any idea.

RG: I guess a cynic could attribute all kinds of less-than-noble motives to this trip. Have you been catching a lot of flak from people?

HARRIS: No, no, that's the first I've heard on that one, because, really, the bulk of the people in it, to the best of my knowledge I'm probably the only elected official in it. And I don't think the motives are cynical at all. I think the motives are quite sincere. They've got a couple of bishops involved in it, and most of the faculty people, if you've known them, who are involved in it have been in it going back a long ways. Well, most of them have some civil rights affiliations, or one thing or another — I think this is quite consistent with their past histories.

The mayor's secretary told us before the interview that there's been a considerable volume of mail, "most of it one line and unsigned, like, 'Go there and stay.'" Most of it, she said, was not from around Ann Arbor — the letters bore postmarks from places like Loveland, Ohio and Niles, Michigan. She said Harris hadn't got to any of it yet, but that she's filing some of the choicer numbers.

RG: Have you had any reaction at the Law School?

HARRIS: Oh, maybe... jokes, a little class reaction, you know, 'Do the bluebooks first,'...

RG: Were you disappointed in that?

HARRIS: No, it's a perfectly pertinent comment. I've been slow doing bluebooks anyway. They'd be less than sane if they didn't make the comment. There's been some comment from people who disagree on the whole question of Southeast Asia foreign policy, so from their point of view the thing is foolish. Others think we'll never be able to physically arrange to get there. Other people, I think, have been
RG: Have you had any reaction here at City Hall one way or another?

HARRIS: Oh, a lot of kidding about how we've got to elect a mayor pro tem first. No, no, basically very few people have commented on it.

RG: No one from the HRP has accused you of trying to co-opt any of "their" positions?

HARRIS: No, I don't think so. I mean I know so. No comment on it whatsoever.

RG: This group is calling itself "Movement for Peace Hostages." In what way do you expect it to be a literal "hostage" action?

HARRIS: Well, I think only in the sense that if we're in Hanoi and Haiphong and the B-52's bomb the hell out of it, it will do our health no good whatsoever. So I suppose you're a hostage in the sense that you're a security against your own government's taking certain acts. It's not that we're telling them to slay us in the event the Americans hit them — it's nothing like that.

RG: As far as you know there's no plan to stay longer than the two-week shift?

HARRIS: No, it's my understanding we'll be on two-week rotations, so there will be a semi-permanent presence. There's not a lot of specific information.

RG: One inviting image I've heard invoked, in several variations, over in the Law School, is of Mayor Harris and 20 or 25 other people tying themselves to railroad bridges or draped spread-eagle on the top of oil refinery tanks.

HARRIS: Hardly. I don't think we've ever discussed it in terms as dramatic as those. I mean, if you knew these people, you'd know they all have a healthy cowardice.

RG: In a sense, don't you think the prisoners of war who've already been taken in Vietnam are sufficient hostages?

HARRIS: Certainly to some extent, certainly. You would think that would deter it. I don't know precisely where they're located, but I would think they would perform some of the same function, and I guess that was one reason a lot of us were surprised at the bombing escalation, and particularly moving it into Hanoi and Haiphong.

But once it moved in there, the feeling was, obviously they're not sufficient hostage. Now you can raise the question, are we sufficient hostage? I suppose if we can't raise the ante above a collection of pawns, we're not going to do any good to ourselves or anyone else. The thought is we can recruit more prominent people.

RG: You're expecting, then, that there's going to be some publicity value attaching to your status as an elected official that will be brought to bear on President Nixon?

HARRIS: Yes, well, the effort is to get, as I say, bishops, prominent scientists, what-have-you, so that it would be politically impossible for him to bomb again. Incidentally, since the initial raid, as you know, there haven't been raids within eighty miles of Hanoi or Haiphong. So — I don't know what that all means, I'm not suggesting we brought that about, it may have been an internal decision only to hit Haiphong once.

RG: If I might borrow a technique from a law professor and spin a little hypothetical —

HARRIS: Sure.

RG: Suppose you arrive in Haiphong, and it starts to rain — it's monsoon season, and every day it rains torrents until, say, October. For some strange reason the bomb-
An interesting vignette is related to the Mayor's projected visit to Hanoi. It bears on where many of us are at.

When the news of the Mayor's participation in the peace party first reached us, a number of Harris' Contracts students were in the room. The initial reaction of one was, "God, now we'll never get our exam grades back with him over there." A second was quick to reply, "Yeah, but when we do, the postcard will have a Hanoi postmark on it. What a phenomenal souvenir." One of our staff was heard to say, "Won't that be a trip."

It sure will.

The war goes on.

-- Eds.

![The Supreme Staff](image)

Res Gestae embarks on a new and, as far as we know, never before attempted summer edition for this coming term. Pending approval of funds, R.G. is planned to appear bi-weekly during the summer term, probably five issues in all. The fare will be the same, only the personnel will change somewhat. Those interested in reporting, set-up or distribution as well as contributors, letter-writers and cranks are urged to contact Helen Forsyth who will be cracking the whip this summer. Phone -- Office: 763-4332 Home: 769-4787.
devoted herself to the interests of all students, not just those who are favored statistically. She has been deeply concerned about reaching larger numbers of students and with trying to persuade firms to reach down further into the class." The Dean related that Ms. Ransford had once said that the "Placement Office can be regarded as operating for the benefit of bar and students and at it's best for both." But, the Dean added, "when there has been a conflict Ann has always tried to do her best for the students."

St. Antoine echoed the sentiments of many students when he cited Ms. Ransford as one who "deserves an enormous amount of recognition for an extremely difficult and trying job well done." Alumni who interview around the country "invariably tell me" said the Dean, "that ours is the best organized, most helpful and most pleasant, placement office they encounter."

The Dean said he had not had time to consider a replacement for Ms. Ransford but did say that notice of the opening had been sent throughout the University community. Prerequisites to the position which he did mention were "judgment and stamina and the ability to take a good deal of criticism."

--T.R.L.
J.J.S.

PLACEMENT OFFICE USE DECLINES FOR 1971-72

For the first time in the Law School's recent history, job interviewing at the Law School by students has declined, according to figures compiled by the Placement Office. Although this year's second and third-year classes are the largest in recent history, there were significantly fewer interviews than last year. Also, a smaller percentage of students had any interviews at all then at least since 1968-69, which was the last year that students were asked not to sign up for interviews with employers if their grade average was lower than what the employer had requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2nd and 3rd yr. students</th>
<th># of interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>3299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>5108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>6287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>820(approx)</td>
<td>5900(approx)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decline in interviewing does not seem to be the result of the tighter job market. According to Placement Director Ann Ransford, the demand for interviews was so sparse that 55 of the 361 employers who had planned to interview in the Fall of 1971 cancelled their visits because of lack of student interest.

Miss Ransford does not feel that the tighter job market in the legal profession last year and this year has hurt Michigan graduates. In fact, in 1971, which along with 1972 reportedly had the worst job situation in the legal profession in recent memory, a higher percentage of students reported definite employment plans than ever before.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-68</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While Miss Ransford fears that she may have inadvertently frightened some students away from interviewing because they misinterpreted her remarks at the Fall Placement meeting concerning the tight job situation, the reason for the decline in interviewing seems to be that students are less interested in the kinds of jobs available through Placement Office interviewing. A number of factors confirm this trend:

1) Few legal aid groups or public interest firms can afford the money or time to interview here. Although student interest in these areas has increased at this Law School, only 3 legal groups interviewed here in 1970-71, compared to at least 42 legal aid and public interest groups which wrote letters to the Placement Office, expressing an interest in hiring students. One proposal to correct this problem is to charge each profit-oriented employer using the Law School's recruiting services a fee, and to use these fees to pay the expenses of non-profit legal groups wanting to interview users.
at the Law School. No law school does this, but at least one firm, O'Melveny & Myers in Los Angeles, contributes $100 to the Alumni Fund for each Michigan graduate that they have. Miss Ransford has opposed the fee-charging idea because she feels it would loosen the Placement Office's control over employers, forcing it, for instance, to allow employers to restrict interviews to students with high grades. Also she believes that fees would discourage some employers from coming.

2) Women and black students do not use the Placement Office very much. According to Ransford, "Women students here go through the most demeaning and degrading interviews imaginable." One reason that women and blacks have not used the Placement Office much in the past may be simply that, before this year's second-year class, there have simply not been very many women or black students. However, whether justified or not, students apparently presume a high degree of prejudice on the part of private employers. Of the over 300 interviews in 1971-72, only 2 were women and 4 or 5 were black. Still, this is a significant increase over their numbers in the past, according to Miss Ransford.

The amount of religious discrimination is unclear. Overt discrimination against Catholics, Jews, and Mormons has been reported in the past. But most students seem to take a firm's religious biases for granted and not much has been reported in the past 3 years. One interviewer for a predominately Jewish firm complained that not more Gentiles had signed up for interviews with his firm. A hopeful note: This year was the first in which some employees asked why they hadn't had any women or blacks to interview.

3) Students are less interested in the highly competitive big-city firms which have traditionally interviewed here and more interested in medium and smaller-sized towns and cities particularly in the Southwest, the Pacific Northwest, and New England. Miss Ransford has noted a significant decline in interest in firms in New York, Los Angeles, and Cleveland, among others. Popular places have become Portland, Seattle, Phoenix, Albuquerque, Atlanta, Boston, Minneapolis, Grand Rapids, Columbus, and other medium-sized cities. There has been a significant decline in the number of students remaining in their home town or home state, from 81% in 1967 down to 43% in 1971. Complementing this graduates are more dispersed geographically now than previously. In 1967 they took jobs in 21 different states, with a gradual increase each year to 29 different states by 1971. Roughly 50% of all students stay in the Midwest for their first job.

If the trend began this year continues, Placement Office policy will have to readjust priorities to serve the new interests and aspirations of the students, Miss Ransford feels. The good old days of the high anxiety "meat market in Room 200" seems to be fading. Few students are still interested in beating out their fellows for the most prestigious or highest-paying jobs. A full-scale reorientation in the atmosphere and direction of Placement Office efforts may be indicated.

If this trend persists along with the recent student vote in favor of pass/fail grading, it may herald a deemphasis of the competitive aspects of law school education. If experience at other law schools is any guide, pass/fail shouldn't damage job chances. This was Yale's experience. At Harvard, optional pass/fail penalized students who chose pass/fail because those who chose the ungraded curriculum were viewed by employers as slackers. According to Miss Ransford, Harvard students found themselves forced by a non-mandatory, alternative system to elect traditional grades in order to compete effectively for the jobs. It is not a healthy situation, Ransford said.

--Tom Lichten

REG cont'd from p. 15

six Overbeck beauties and getting three used U-Cellar irregulars in return. That's socialism.

Given the cancerous burgeoning of cheating that the new policy implies, perhaps there is only one final solution. If you can't trust a lawyer this far, then you shouldn't be educating him at all.

-- J.J.S.
DEAN CALLS ABA PROPOSAL "SERIOUS MISTAKE"

"In a technical sense and in a deeper policy sense, it is a serious mistake." In those words Dean Theodore St. Antoine characterized the ABA proposal to study the feasibility of screening law school applicants for character and fitness. (see RG 4/21/72, p. 1)

The report of the ABA Special Committee was misguided for several reasons, elaborated the Dean. "It's clear as a practical matter," he said, "that many students enter law school in furtherance of a general education and may not even be planning to practice where they would need to be members of a bar." There is the necessity, he thought, that those who "have been convicted of crimes or arrested in civil rights or anti-war demonstrations," although they might in a narrow, technical sense be prohibited from the practice of law in the courts of some states, should, nevertheless, not be discouraged from undertaking legal study.

Turning to the policy facets of the proposal, St. Antoine observed, that the program "does constitute a hidden threat against potentially unacceptable people." This sort of deterrence theory, the Dean believes, is unsound. "It fails to take into account the healing passage of time," he said. Students reviewed at some point in their senior years in college or early in law school might appear unworthy to the bar examiners. Preliminary screening might reveal one sort of person, the Dean said, "but after three years at hard work, a new individual might emerge." After law school, the examining process is "put into a new time frame. This notion of having the decision made in advance," he indicated, seems undesirable if not unworkable.

Alluding to R.G.'s editorial last week, St. Antoine agreed that possibly, "underneath it all is a warning off, a warning to students: don't be too daring in your actions or with regard to conventional thinking or modes of behavior." The attempt to contain members of the legal profession in any narrow mold, he was sure will prove futile.

While declining to speculate about the motives of the report's drafters, the Dean did recognize the fact that, "the recommendation has emerged at a time when members of the bar are nervous and unduly so, I think, at the increasing size of the bar. Economic considerations may well have entered into their consideration. We know that the numbers of students in law school now has doubled in recent years. I understand that the population of the practicing will also double in, I think it is, a matter of twelve years." These factors the Dean concluded might explain the desire displayed by the report to curtail the numbers of lawyers forthcoming.

--J.J.S.

TRIVIA, INC., Department

There are many "facts" about the law school which every law student should know for his or her own edification. Strange, but true, these interesting tidbits deserve wider publication. To wit:

1) Why is the Crease Ball called the "Crease" Ball?

Ans: Supposedly because many years ago (when law students led a more cloistered, ascetic life) they "creased" their best pair of pants only once a year = for the Crease Ball. (of course)

2) If I want to know how the Michigan Supreme Court will decide an issue what's the easiest way to find out?

Ans: Take the elevator to the 10th floor of the Law Library and go to the office of Michigan Supreme Court Justice John Swainson. Ask him. Justice Swainson has a "suite" on the 10th floor (yes, Virginia, there is a tenth floor). The 10th floor is also a good place (it is alleged) to watch the sunbathers on the roofs of the various society houses near the law school (for all you MCP's). cont'd p. 15
COUNTERTORIAL cont'd from p. 3

Law school enrollment. Knocking 5,000, 10,000, 15,000 out of law school on a character test, especially when there are so few character flunkies right now? -- I shudder.

Whereas the ABA may be going about things in a woefully misguided way, they have put their finger on a real problem. Indeed, a newly created ABA committee, the Task Force on Professional Utilization, will specifically consider the problem of the size of the profession. And there is a problem. In the last ten years, the number of law students has doubled. The number of yearly new admissions to the bar has nearly doubled. By 1984, there will be twice as many lawyers in the U.S.

In a recent article (Juris Doctor, April 1972), two commentators laud this trend and in fact urge the need for more lawyers. There is little doubt that the services of more lawyers could be used, but the fact is they are not being used. Juris Doctor blithely says that all the new lawyers can be used by increasing the government funding for legal aid type programs. But the facts are that these programs are being cut back.

In raw, cold figures: there are now 30,000 first year law students -- there are expected to be 14,500 jobs open for them in 1974. This year at Michigan, new graduates are having trouble landing jobs. At the risk of sounding elitist, what are our brethren at the lesser lights in the midwest doing for jobs?

There is a school of thinkers that still persists -- the new, unhired lawyers will hit the streets on their own, competition will be injected into the profession, prices for services will then go down, and consequently, more legal services will be available to more people. This is an unproven (and perhaps unprovable) hypothesis. But even granting its truth, there is still a major hole in it. More legal service does not necessarily mean better legal service. Anyone who has seen the court house criminal lawyer, or who has met a victim of shoddy legal services will realize that the profession has a disturbing number of disgusting characters. If the streets swell with lawyers scrambling for clients, ethics could easily take a dive. And I for one am not ready to assert that the morals of our generation are superior to that sort of thing.

Until the jobs are there, it is wrong to keep pouring out law graduates. A little limiting might be in order. The limiting should come from within and not without. The ABA should not do the limiting, and certainly not through its character test proposal. It would be sad indeed to end up like the AMA and the medical profession. The limiting should be done by the law schools themselves. This year, Michigan cut back the size of its freshman class. This was not done with the size of the legal profession in mind, but for other reasons. If it is not already too late, perhaps the size of next year's class should be considered with something beyond Michigan in mind.

-- B.J.H.

One of the ABA-screened law school applicants preparing for admission

December 1972, May & August 1973 Graduates

Preparing Resumes

The deadline for turning in resumes to the Placement Office is September 20. This allows for only two and a half weeks from the time your return to law school to meet the deadline. As a consequence, you should prepare your resume over the summer months so that you will have time to get a picture and have it printed when you return. (Printing may take as long as two weeks.) Suggestions for preparing resumes are available in the Placement Office.
Professor Galbraith wrote, it now appears, half of one very fine book on the real components of the American economy. Unfortunately, instead of stopping when he had said what he had to say, Galbraith continued on to make pronouncements (the implications, he says, of his new theory) that simply are no longer worth the reading. One wishes one were reviewing only the first two-hundred-odd pages; it is somehow disagreeable to have to be critical of a writer so witty and stylish as the former Ambassador.

The New Industrial State could as easily be read as a scathing critique of contemporary (one hesitates after reading Galbraith to call it modern) economics teaching as a treatise on what giant corporations have done to the market, to demand, to prices, to personnel and to organization in general. He makes a convincing case for the obsolescence of most market theory central to elementary economics, making a point of skewering anyone and everyone who could be thought of as an Authority of the market theory. He displays statistics that are by now thoroughly familiar (likely in large part because of the impact of this book) about the concentration of wealth and power in the few largest corporations, the volume of business done by the largest few thousand compared with all the rest, and concludes that textbook models of a market structure indifferent to the actions of the individual actor are malignantly inadequate. No doubt at all about the truth of Galbraith's own theory; but perhaps the Professor forgets what it was like many dark years ago before he was our most Prominent Economist. I, for one, found textbook models quite necessary three short months ago; Lipsey and Steiner's basic text does not press the case for general acceptance of simplified preliminary assumptions as passionately as Galbraith would have us believe the villains in his book (including, incredibly, Paul Samuelson) do. One has to start somewhere, after all; I first picked up The New Industrial State four years ago, and got only a hundred pages or so into it before I gave up. After a basic economic course (E. 400) I had no trouble with it. So much for the usefulness of even obsolete theory.

** * **

The bare-bones of Galbraith's general theory, as near as I can make out, are this: the chief characteristic of firms most important in our industrial economy is size; size and increasing technology, together with their concomitants (specialization, and separation in time of the end result from its beginnings) dictate that the uncertainties of the market be replaced with a mechanism less riddled with chance. Moreover, size does something else: it renders the mature corporation's nominal owners, the corporation's stockholders, and even the directors, powerless before the group processes of what Galbraith has called the technostructure, the concentric circles of managers, technicians, engineers, sales strategists, etc., who collectively assemble the data necessary for decisions in such a way that decisions are already thereby made. Planning's role is accentuated (nothing new for readers of Lipsey and Steiner's section on monopoly and oligopoly), and the market is superseded by vertical integration or avoided by tacit or illicit agreement or by contracts between sellers and purchasers. The objective of the corporation, associated as it is with the economy's scarce factor, is no longer profit maximization, as it was when capital was the firm's least available factor: the resource that makes the difference today is organization itself, the techno-structure, and so the goals of the industrial system are security and survival, or at least these goals take some degree of precedence over profit maximization. (Just what degree of precedence will be examined shortly.) The statement summarizing this Galbraithian proposition appears on page 168:

cont'd p. 14

page thirteen
"The effects of low and high earnings on the technostructure are not symmetrical. With low earnings or losses it becomes vulnerable to outside influence and loses its autonomy. But above a certain level more earnings add little or nothing to its security therein . . . . By the most elementary calculation of self-interest, the technostructure is compelled to put prevention of loss ahead of maximum return."

To the degree, therefore, that consumer demand for the products of the industrial system can be manipulated (that is to say, to the degree indifference curves can be over-ridden) the demand must be tailored to the service of these objectives.

* * *

Very well. This much is more-or-less new in Galbraith. At least one is moderately assured that such far-reaching synthesis of wide-ranging observations is Galbraith's unique contribution. But in the manner of many men who are wise in certain of the workings of the world, Galbraith felt it necessary to sketch out the "implications" of his theory, and in applying it to a huge variety of issues, he comes across, finally, as one more best-selling book monger hawking surreptitious Truth about as many subjects as you have the money and the patience -- to afford.

We learn from Galbraith, for instance, that advertising manipulates people's desires to the point that they become "the kind of man the goals of the industrial system require--one that reliably spends his income and works reliably because he is always in need of more." (p. 210) One is hard put to see why Galbraith thought this proposition exceptionable enough to devote a chapter to it. Weren't even such dimbulbs as Vance Packard and Jack Kerouac, to pick two of the more divergent and mild social commentators of the 1950's, saying that years ago?

Galbraith tells us, in one of his more outrageous non-sequiturs, that, since consumer demand is managed, in largest part, by commercial messages on radio and television, "the industrial system . . . could not exist in its present form without [them]." (p. 208) The learned Professor might well profit from his constant reiteration of the danger of overstatement.

On and on Galbraith drones, in the hushed tones of one who is convinced he is revealing state secrets, to the effect that unions are losing membership (white collar "technostructure" personnel are replacing them, you see), people are staying in school longer (the technostructure requires specialized skills to a greater extent than day labor in the steel mills), a large portion of the governmental expenditures that the industrial system requires consists in military spending (news, huh?), and the industrial system has something less than a keen eye for aesthetics (Flint isn't as good-looking as Venice). If it took Galbraith's theory of the new industrial state to explain such pedestrian phenomena as these, perhaps he was saying less than many originally supposed.

In truth, of course, the first two-hundred pages are a unique contribution to economic thought while the second two-hundred represent a bright fellow's unfortunate attempts to encapsule the entire universe of knowledge now that he has significantly altered it. Willie Mays might as well try to explain California earthquakes in terms of home-runs. Witty and incisive as he is, Galbraith is plainly over his head when he speaks of foreign policy, urban planning, and the arts.

If his less weighty pronunciations require something short of scrutiny, however, Galbraith's significant analyses deserve some discussion. Profit maximization, he demonstrates, has been replaced as a major goal of the mature corporation, which is now autonomously controlled by an intensely group-oriented technostructure interested more in minimum returns and growth, which enhance its security and control.

Before very much is made of this, however, two things must be pointed out: First, profit maximization is a pretty slippery notion, probably furthered more by the decisions made by a technostructure for which it is a secondary goal (see cont'd p. 15
TRIVIA  cont'd from p. 11
Answers Requested:

3) What is the mysterious, framed
document on the second floor wall
across from the moot court room?

4) Where is the Dean's second office?
Does he still have one?

5) How many chairs are in Hutchins
Hall?

6) What does I.C.L.E. really do?

7) Who is in charge of the Law School
bulletin boards?

8) Is it true that W. Cook stipulated
that ice cream and jello should be
available to all residents of the Lawyers
Club at every meal? Was Martha Cook
really his mother's name? How much
money is in the Cook Fund now?

9) Was the Law Quad ever green?

10) What is the difference between
an Assistant Professor and Associate
Professor (besides $)?

--J. Watts

MORE GALBRAITH  cont'd from p. 14
Galbraith's own discussion of how Henry
Ford nearly ruined the family business,
most assuredly in service to what he con­
ceived of as profit maximization p. 90)
than by an old-style entrepreneur with his
own ideas of corporate propriety.

Second, while a main requisite for corporate
survival, whether in fact or only in the
public consciousness, is co-existence with the
environment, few firms will spend from excess­
ive profits even the most minimal sums
necessary for environmental preservation
when a two-page full-color magazine spread
will momentarily keep the wolf, i.e.
Congress or Ralph Nader, from the door.
It is doubtful, as Nader has repeatedly
pointed out, if many firms would even miss
sums expended to clean up their products
or their effluents, yet they resist these
expenditures with all the tenacity of an
old-time profit maximizer. If the differ­
ence is this slight, perhaps there is no
distinction worth making. --J.N.S.

New Bluebook Reg

The creativity of the current law
school administration seems bound­
less. For instance, some anonymous
author has quietly instituted a "new
bluebook policy." The notice -- a
neatly typed green index card, dated
4/24/72 -- recently crept onto the
law school bulletin board. It in­
dicates that in exams where notes or
outlines are prohibited, all student
bluebooks will be collected at the door
and then redistributed randomly to
the test-takers. Now there is the
inspired scheme of a small mind.

The evil which is supposedly remedied
by the new policy is the secreting of
"study aids" in the bluebooks. If
cheating of this type is so widespread
as to deserve a new policy, then per­
haps everyone will come in with doctored
bluebooks, and the collective knowledge
of the class will simply be redistributed:
an interesting experiment in democratic
learning.

On the other hand student ingenuity
cannot be expected to collapse in the
face of the new policy. The fully
clothed human anatomy is rife with
little crannies in which fragments of
course outlines may be ferreted. The
obvious bureaucratic response is to
require that exams be taken while
nude. But the state legislators might
well protest that the two sexes would
distract one another (extremely unlikely,
in fact, given the level of intensity
devoted to exam taking here) and require
that sexes be segregated during exams.
That clearly would violate HEW sex
guidelines. It's a horny dilemma indeed.

A simple answer would be for the law
school itself to supply the bluebooks.
In addition to fulfilling the policy
imperatives of official paranoia,
this would spare law students any
further investment in the Overbeck's
cartel. The likelihood is good, how­
ever, that the law school will buy
bargain-cheapies in bluebooks, thereby
depriving law students of the thrill
of enshrining their answers on Overbeck's
golden bond. The inequities under
the "share the wealth" philosophy
of the new policy are also apparent
in this regard. Imagine handing over

cont'd p. 10
You Do This Once Every Few Days Department?

The Res Gestae is pleased as punch to be the first to rush into publication the Central Student Judiciary’s Opinion in Forsyth v. Michigan Union, a case which establishes that sex discrimination is a no no vis a vis étudians and pedants. Actually, we could care less, happy as we are to be here, but two of our editors kept bugging us.

--RG

OPINION

Forsyth v. Michigan Union Board of Directors--Central Student Judiciary Docket # 72/003 20 Mar 72

Facts:

This case was brought by Ms. Helen Forsyth to require the Michigan Union to afford her all the incidents of life membership in the Union. The Union stipulated during preliminary hearing that Ms. Forsyth's application has not been considered because the constitution of the Union and its charter with the state of Michigan specifically limited membership to male associates and students. The Union further stipulated that it had reviewed the policy and, pursuant to its constitution, had begun the process to open membership without regard to sex. However, since a 30 day pre-election publication period was ordained by that constitution no change could be wrought before the November 1972 election.

By a vote of 4-0, the Judiciary accepted jurisdiction under Art. IX Sec. C of the All-Campus Constitution as an original jurisdiction case. The case was set for hearing on the question as to whether Art. VIII, Sec. A, Para. 26, the "equal rights proviso", is applicable to a situation of discrimination based on sex.

Decision

Since the defendant Michigan Union has stipulated that the reason plaintiff Forsyth's application was not acted upon was the mandated restriction of membership to male members of the University community, the sole question is whether the terms of Para. 26 of the Bill of Rights of the All-Campus Constitution encompasses discrimination by sex. The applicable provision only states that all benefits must be available to all members of the University community without regard to race, color, social class, political views, national origin, religious creed, or any other arbitrary or unreasonable consideration.

Thus, the issue remaining is whether sex is an arbitrary or unreasonable basis for discrimination. While the Union has pointed to interpretations of similar provisions in the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Art. I Sec. 2 of the Michigan Constitution which have held sex discrimination reasonable, the continued application of such analyses is seriously in doubt. First, the Supreme Court has invalidated sex discrimination when it is proposed as the basis for choice of executors, Reed v. Reed, and appears to be ready to undertake, on a limited basis, review of similar provisions. Second, the original basis for the conclusion that sex discrimination was reasonable was the historical context of the Fourteenth Amendment and its state progeny. That context is becoming less significant as the courts begin to focus

cont'd p.17
on the results, rather than the purposes of the discrimination under the rubric of "active" review. Finally, that historical context is irrelevant here since the provision in question was drafted to provide for a general equality of rights and did not attempt to proscribe every possible basis no matter how absurd. Thus, the Court finds that sex is an arbitrary and unreasonable consideration and any benefit conditioned upon it must be made available without discrimination by sex.

Order

1) By a vote of 3-0, the Central Student Judiciary finds that the provision in Art. III. Membership of the Constitution of the University of Michigan Union is repugnant to Sec. A Para. 26 of the Student Bill of Rights insofar as it reads "The membership shall be confined to men". For this reason the Court orders that the Board of the Union take no further cognizance of this provision as it applies here.

2) By a vote of 3-0, the Judiciary orders the Board to reconsider Ms. Forsyth's application for Life Membership in the Union without regard to her sex and under the interpretation of their Constitution as specified above.

3) Further, the Judiciary recommends that the Board cease its consideration of sex of applicants in determining eligibility for membership.

4) The Court takes note of the efforts that the Board has taken to end this discrimination and thanks it for its diligence in attempting to eliminate this absurd qualification for membership only ten years after the Union was integrated by sex.

Mark Goldsmith, Chairman
Mandy Behe
Ron Henry
Joel Newman

LAW SCHOOL COALITION FOR PEACE STARTS PETITION DRIVE

The Law School Coalition for Peace, headquartered at Stanford Law School, has launched a petition drive against the escalation of the air war in Indo-China. An open statement calling for cessation of the bombing throughout Vietnam and for resumption of peace negotiations has been signed by a majority of the Stanford Law community, including administrators, faculty, students and staff.

The statement is conceived as only a first step, but, local coordinators maintain, a vital one in the continual mobilization of protest against the re-escalation. It is an attempt to forge an immediate consensus of opposition at the one hundred and forty-eight law schools in this country.

Included among the National Sponsors are T.J. St. Antoine, University of Michigan, Abraham Goldstein, Yale Law School, and Albert M. Sachs, Harvard Law School. It is imperative that all members of the community who agree with this statement sign a copy and deposit it in one of the appropriate boxes by Friday, April 28th.
The latest installment of the Goldband Papers was left on the doorstep of the R.G. just in time for the term's final issue. The document, which is printed below for your amazed eyes, was ferreted from the inner vaults of the Law Library by a dedicated and unimpeachable source. It is authentic.

Carbon 17 tests run on the yellowed 4X5 card revealed that it dates from the 60's or, in the opinion of one expert, from the 50's.

This latest find shows the revolutionary foresight of the faculty of the 50's and 60's in anticipating the grading system of the 70's, complete with percentage distribution of grades within each class. Understandably the forefathers of today's faculty were not so enlightened as to discover that the grading scale could be even further fragmented by the addition of A+, B+ and D+.

Today's faculty deserves credit not only for preserving these fine old grading traditions, but for making the grading system even more arbitrary and misleading. Watch the summer edition of the R.G. for further developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester 19 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Grade Distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.L.S. BRINGS STUDENT'S RIGHTS CASE

The first suit in the history of the prestigious American Soc'y of International Law has been brought by the Michigan Internat'l Law Soc'y.

Growing out of an alleged arbitrary decision which cost the Michigan Jessup Internat'l Law Moot Court team 1st place in the Midwest Regionals, and a chance to compete in the nationals this week in Washington, D.C., the suit asks the Superior Court of D.C. to recognize the right of a student association to challenge in the courts decisions handed down by the parent organization.

As a group spokesman commented: "This is essentially a case of student rights and institutional accountability. When a national student organization concedes that its decision is based on unclear and ambiguous grounds, resulting in unfairness to members, yet insists that its word is final, this not only leaves a bad taste in the mouths of all concerned, but gives rise to a duty on the part of those members offended to render the institution accountable."

"I'll buy the popcorn."

For heaven's sake, bub, with a nose like yours, it's a wonder she even looked at you. Go to the movies.

"Well, I don't know. The roller derby doesn't come through here that often."

Shooting to my feet, I grit my teeth to keep from yelling out unconditional acceptance on behalf of the roller derby freak. A moment thereafter, it occurs to me how conspicuous I am standing in the aisles with clenched fists at my sides, and I shuffle off red-faced to the lavatory to wait two or three minutes before coming back.

Bars were the first public places I had to spurn forever, since those hangouts are veritably crawling with oddballs who don't know what they're talking about. Then, it was hotel lobbies. Now, it's restaurants. Yes, it looks as if I'm headed for the hermit's life. With all due respect to AMTRAK, I'm afraid railroad terminals are the only places I have left to go. There's never anybody there.
April 26, 1972

Dear Senior:

The Cellar Bookstore owes you five dollars upon your graduation. Why not assign that five dollars to the Law School Fund?

The Law School Fund was established eleven years ago to provide money for Law School activities and facilities which could not be provided out of tuition and state appropriations. A few examples of how the Law School Fund monies are used include increased student financial aid, supplementary library purchases, support for several student activities, "seed money" for the legal aid program, providing money for re-lighting the library reading room and the building of the placement interview rooms in Room 200.

The added activities and facilities have enhanced your educational opportunities, and will keep Michigan among the great Law Schools of the world. Michigan's reputation will follow you wherever you go.

The gift is easy and painless; just fill out the assignment attached below and return it either to Room 161 Legal Research (the Law School Fund Office across from the Copy Center), the Lawyers Club Desk, or to Professor Proffitt (his office is 328 Hutchins Hall, or his mail box on the third floor of Hutchins Hall).

Sincerely,

Robert Kuhbach
Past President, Student Senate

I __________________________ hereby assign my rights to the five dollar (print) book store deposit payable to me from the Cellar Book Store to The University of Michigan Law School Fund, and direct that the five dollar deposit be delivered to the Director of The University of Michigan Law School Fund, 161 Legal Research Building, on my behalf.

Date ______________________ Signature ___________________________
(legibly, please)
Student I.D. # __________________________
Date of Graduation _______________________
FAR FROM THE MADDING CROWD

I've given up going to restaurants these days. It's too frustrating. At least the crowded ones are out-of-bounds. You see, I have this nasty habit of wanting to finish other people's conversations around me, which by all accounts is terribly rude.

"Harry."

"Hm."

"What baseball player's name begins with e-v; five letters?"

Long pause. Why doesn't he answer, the idiot; anybody knows that one. I grip the sides of my booth, dying to cry out, Tinker to EVERS, and so on.

"Uh, Evers. The player's name is Evers."

Whew! Saved that time from catastrophic embarrassment. But can it possibly last.

"You know, I've been so impressed lately with the early work of this Jacques Roualt. His ballet scenes show simply an exquisite sense of movement without over-extension."

Trembling with disgust, I scream to myself, Roualt's name is George, you vacuous dilettante, and it was Degas that did all the dancers.

"Oh, and I was intrigued to learn the other day that James Whistler was really quite far out in his day, and painted these 'sojourns' that everybody hated."

That's "nocturnes" you clown. If he doesn't shut up, I swear I'll have to get up and beat him over the head with a napkin holder.

"It's not that I don't like sports, even the roller derby, Fred, but I'd much rather go to a movie."

"Aw, movies. There's lots of live action at the rink, Phyllis, that you can't get at the movies."

cont'd p.18

"Yea Mickey Mouse Club!"