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Civil Procedure Topic of Cooley Lectures

American and European law professors will discuss the reform of civil procedure at the 12th annual Thomas M. Cooley Lectures sponsored by the University of Michigan Law School November 17-19.

Speakers are: Maurice Rosenberg of Columbia University, whose topic is "Devising Procedures that are Civil to Promote Justice that is Civilized;" Benjamin Kaplan of Harvard University who will give his impressions of British civil procedure; and Mauro Cappelletti of the University of Florence, Italy, who will speak on reforms and legal treads in Western and Eastern Europe.

Rosenberg will speak at 4:15, November 17; Kaplan's lecture will be at 4:15 November 18; and Capelletti will speak at 3:15 November 19. The lectures will be in Room 100 of Hutchins Hall.

ICLE Offers Environmental Conference Here

New Environmental laws and the response of industry to stricter environmental controls will be among the subjects discussed at a seminar sponsored by the Institute of Continuing Legal Education here.

The seminar, entitled "Environmental Law--1970", will be held November 13 and 14 at Chrysler Center at the University of Michigan's North Campus.

Among the featured speakers are U-M Law Professor Joseph L. Sax, who drafted Michigan's new Environmental Protection Act; William M. Kritzmiller, legislative aide to Congressman Richard L. Ottinger of New York and an authority on conservation issues affecting federal agencies; and Howard Shaper, general counsel to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Registration information for the environmental law seminar can be obtained from the Institute, 417 Hutchins Hall.

DRAFT SEMINAR INTERVIEWS THIS WEEK

During the Winter Semester Professor Lempert, in conjunction with three young lawyers from the community will be offering a seminar on SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW and the SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM. The seminar will meet on Monday evenings from 7:15 to 9:15. The basic requirement for credit will be a paper and perhaps two short memoranda. In addition participants will be expected to engage in about six hours of observation and counseling at the Ann Arbor Draft Counseling Center. The seminar will be limited to a maximum of 12. If you wish to participate please see Professor Lempert in Room 835 for an interview before Friday, November 20.
Women Lawyers Facing Discrimination, Statistics Show

Some interesting support for the premise that there is discrimination against women lawyers was presented in a recent issue of Legal Economics News, published by the ABA Standing Committee on Economics of Law Practice.

By way of preface, the article pointed out that only 2.8 percent of the graduate lawyers in the country are women, according to an American Bar Foundation study. The discrimination, however, according to the publication "flourishes beneath a carefully constructed facade of sex equality."

It then goes on to cite examples in demonstrating discrimination practices.

One is a survey conducted for the ABA by Barbara Armstrong of Harvard who writes, "Ninety percent of the lawyers who wish to engage a law clerk refuse even to interview women, and such openings as there are often call for stenography."

The Legal Economics News story refers to the book "The Wall Street Lawyer" in illustrating discrimination by law firms. According to the book, a number of Wall Street firms still elect to employ male stenographers when possible. And, though some New York firms now employ women, seldom do they admit women to partnership status, the article states.

Income is probably the biggest point of discrimination, according to the Legal Economics News article. It referred to a survey by James J. White reporting on a sampling of women law graduates between 1955-65 comparing salaries of women and men lawyers. The survey showed that starting salaries of women were from $600 to $1500 less than men with approximately the same background and experience, and after nine years of practice, men earned from $9,000 to $16,000 per year more than women lawyers in comparable positions.

Concern over a woman lawyer not staying with a firm very long was cited in the Legal Economics News article as a point of discrimination that has little validity based on the White survey. It showed that after three years, 30 percent of the males and 29 percent of the females surveyed still retained their first position.

--- American Bar News
October 1970

Women React

Women in the law school have made some modest but positive steps in the past weeks toward improving the condition of women in law.

Of the six student speakers at the hearing held by the deanship committee last month, six were women. They emphasized the need for a dean aware of the problems of women in law and committed to affirmative action in this area.

Several women made a presentation before the Committee of Visitors on the subject to discrimination against women in law.

Men and women staffed a table in the fishbowl, a high-traffic area for Lit. School students changing classes, on November 4 and 5. They talked with women about attending law school and gave out Information about the LSAT and law school applications. The night of November 5 an information meeting on law school was held for women in the Law Club Lounge. It was attended by more than 80 women. Arrangements are being made with the women who attended the meeting who expressed a desire to visit a law school class with one of the women students.
To the Editor:

Students seeking part-time legal work and a practical learning experience to supplement their formal education may be interested in The Research Group, a nationwide research service for attorneys-at-law, which has its midwestern regional office located across the street from the Law School, above Dominick's. A business enterprise established for the purpose of providing legal research for practicing attorneys, The Research Group represents an innovative approach to the needs of the legal profession.

Organized initially in October of last year by law students attending the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, The Research Group has since expanded to a nationwide service with regional offices in Cambridge, Mass.; New Haven, Conn.; Washington, D.C.; Austin, Texas; and Palo Alto, Calif.; as well as in Charlottesville and Ann Arbor. Although the Research Group is independent of any law school, the organization employs law students as researchers and editors. In addition to individual problem research, The Research Group also publishes monthly state "Researchers" in eleven states. These "Researchers" include digests of all of the most recent cases decided by state and federal courts within the states involved and also include more detailed analyses of one or two key decisions each month.

The Ann Arbor office publishes the Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin "Researchers" and plans to begin publication in additional states in the near future. These publications may be of interest to seniors as a helpful bar review aid and can be obtained at a special student subscription rate. A similar digest of United States Supreme Court opinions is now being published by the Charlottesville office.

Since March of this year the Ann Arbor Research Group has handled almost 300 research problems for practicing attorneys. Approximately twenty students are currently employed as researchers, editors and salesmen by the Ann Arbor office which is under the supervision of Neill Hollenshead, a 1970 graduate of the University of Michigan Law School.

Research problems submitted by an attorney by mail, telephone or personal visit receive an initial survey and analysis by the managing or student associate editor. If written questions are unclear, then they are discussed by telephone with the attorney. The problem is then assigned to a student who researches the problem and writes a memorandum on the questions involved with the problem throughout the course of research and is responsible for reviewing the completed memorandum. Student researchers usually receive problems in a wide range of areas, but specialization in areas of particular interest to the researcher is possible. Problems generally involve 10-12 hours of work although attorneys may specify an hour limitation.

For second-year students interested in becoming researchers, a tryout period will be scheduled early next semester. In addition, there are now a few openings for qualified second and third-year students who are capable researchers and interested in exposure to the work of the practicing attorney. Applications are available at The Research Group, 812 Monroe, above Dominick's.

--Sally Farrell

Anyone willing to help out a church group by participating in a mock trial of a polluter, please call 763-2176 or 769-3939 or stop in Room 234 Hutchins Hall. This is quite important to a certain high school kid and might even be fun for you.
On ROTC

To the Editor:

On page 1 of the November edition of RG, under the heading "Off ROTC" there is detailed an account of what I feel is a serious abuse of authority by the Board of Directors.

As I understand it, the Board's function is to represent the interests of the entire law school community. Thus, when one reads of the Board's decision not to comply with the University's request for 2 nominations to the ROTC Governing Board based on the belief that "the University community is not a proper place in which to conduct military training" (although this judgment seems to be at odds with the connotation of the word "university"), one assumes that the Board's action is at least reflective of an overwhelming like sentiment on the part of the student body. But the Board appears to have acted in this matter on its own initiative. The question arises— from whence came the Board's mandate for this action?

My own view of the Board's authority in questions such as this is obviously radically different from that of 8 of the members, for I believe that in all cases involving responsible extra-law school activities which are open to participation by law students, the Board must at least publicize such activities and transmit the response to the interested parties.

The Board's action on this particular question I consider serious because of the indispensable role ROTC graduates play in the armed forces, especially in the Army. (For anyone interested in an objective analysis of the problems we face in this area, I recommend the 2 installments of "Soldiers" by Ward Just appearing in the Oct. & Nov. issues of the Atlantic.)

The Board's intimation that OCS or "other means" (?) are a suitable alternative to an ROTC officer underscores its lack of competence to make a considered judgment in this area. (While there is a definite role for the OCS officer, it is diminishing, and is not typically at the highest levels of command. Q: Who are the Army's 2 most famous OCS graduates? A: Capt. Ernest Medina and Lt. William Calley).

One would hope that prospective lawyers would be better able to resist the temptation to succumb to the popular passion of the moment. There are various channels through which the 8 members in question could have made their sentiments known. But unfortunately, in choosing this more spectacular approach, they effectively curtailed the rights of individual students to be heard on this issue putting perhaps well-meaning, but personal interests above their duty to the student body.

I guess it's probably clear that I am in fundamental disagreement with the majority of the Board on this question. But, contrary to the rhetoric, the ROTC issue is a complex one about which reasonable men might well find themselves diametrically opposed. What I feel should be emphasized though, is the potential harm the Board does itself in arrogating a right to speak for the entire student body without making any effort to ascertain what the community's feelings are. To illustrate my point, let me present a slightly different scenario: The University has decided to send 2 student representatives to an international peace conference in Stockholm, all expenses paid, for 2 weeks. The Board is asked for 2 nominations. However, feeling that the probable close association at the conference of law students with members of a political organization which officially advocates violent overthrow of "capitalist, imperialist" governments would not be proper for members of the Law School community, the Board refuses to act on the request.

While I have more confidence in the Board than to seriously think such an absurd result could occur, nonetheless to sanction its action regarding the ROTC issue would set a precedent for similar abuses in the future.
Thus, with confidence shaken (but not gone), I say to the Board (specifically to 8 members) -- Right On! Keep doing your own thing. But during your deliberations in the heady corridors of power, remember the people. OK?

-- Pete Kelly

P.S. Kudos to Dusty Smith for keeping his cool over an issue which, while full of much sound and fury, has thus far been signified by little intelligent discussion.

Smile

To the Editor:

The Board of Directors of the Lawyers Club has unanimously approved the allocation of funds for the construction and operation of the darkroom facilities will be discussed. Any person interested in using the darkroom facilities, but unable to attend the meeting, please contact me after next Wednesday. The darkroom will be operational next week.

-- Harold R. Oseff

HH Lounge: Mess

To the Editor:

It is quite satisfying to observe that the employees and the faculty of the Law School each have their own lounge which includes fresh food and coffee and pleasant surroundings. The Law School is certainly to be complimented on furnishing such nice facilities.

Hail student lounge which has only vending machines and wretched surroundings. To visit the lounge about 3 p.m. any afternoon is an appalling experience perhaps only surpassed by visiting the alley behind your favorite restaurant. For most law students who don't live in the law quad the H.H. lounge is the only facility of its kind they ever see (No wonder Dominic's is so popular). While various school lounges all over campus are improved and frequented more every year (i.e. Business School lounge), the H.H. lounge gets worse. Its use has markedly diminished in the past two years as seniors will testify. It would seem that 1100 law students, most of whom live outside the law quad, could easily support a decent facility were one offered to them.

A major improvement would be to quadruple the janitorial service now provided to the lounge. The sanitation condition therein would probably kill a sanitation inspector (presumably law students have developed immunity through exposure). Students could also help out by using the trash cans provided. Additionally, the decor and lighting could be improved substantially even by someone with a minimum of imagination. And finally the possibility of providing fresh food as is done in the other law school lounges and as is done in the Business School lounge should be seriously considered. Even the vending machines have gotten worse in the last two years, not to mention the furniture.

Evidently the philosophy enjoying current popularity is: Why do anything for the lounge when few people use it? Perhaps the philosophy should be: Let's make the lounge pleasant, so students will have a decent place to go. It seems to me that the Lawyers Club Board of Directors could take the necessary steps (in cooperation with the Administration, of course) to make the H.H. lounge a place where law students can go to feel relaxed, comfortable, and uncontaminated.

--Joseph Sinclair, '71
Fighting Women of the Week:

The Women's Rights Committee of New York University Law School, where over 5% of the nation's women law students attend, charged admissions policies and financial aid awards after admission discriminated against women applicants. Reacting to a decrease to 20% women in this year's entering class, they have demanded the removal of Dean of Admissions Peter Winograd. (U. of M. Law School has a 9% of women in this year's entering class. Dean McCauley?)

Law School Dean of the Week:

Rev. Father Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean of law at Boston College, was elected in Massachusetts last week to the U.S. House of Representatives. Drinan is a longtime dove who favors immediate pullout from Vietnam. After the election, Drinan declared, "I have proven a clergyman can get elected." It is therefore not clear as political precedent as to whether an ordinary law school dean might win political victory.

Michigan County of the Week:

Lake County has bucked all sorts of opposition by state officials and Governor Milliken and has declared war on throwaway bottles and cans. The county has passed a far reaching ordinance to bar the sale of beer and soft drinks in the disposable containers. It has been predicted that the movement Lake County started will lead to state legislation and it has already initiated efforts in Oakland and Wayne Counties. Perhaps someone should inform a high official of the Ann Arbor administration of such legislation's wisdom and apparent feasibility.

Notes

Underground

New Publications in Amerika

It is interesting to discover that the hardhats & company can and do exert a lot of political pressure against what they consider revolutionary forces. A couple of editors from Ramparts recently started a new magazine called Scanlan's Monthly which has thus far published about three issues. Their October issue, "Guerilla Warfare in the U.S.", is still unprinted, however. It seems that the Amalgamated Lithographers prevented the issue from being printed in New York (the usual place) and then again in San Francisco, Colorado, Missouri, and elsewhere. The editors have finally resorted to bringing out the October issue in paperback book form as the November issue. It is contemplated that subsequent issues of the magazine will have to be printed in a foreign country. Evidently there are more dangers to free speech in America than one normally would think of.

Scanlan's Monthly, incidently, is quite an interesting magazine with some first rate articles of an uncomplimentary (to the establishment) nature. Another new publication along the lines of a slightly radical Consumer's Report is a newsletter called Moneysworth. In the first three issues it has offered such articles as "A Consumer's Guide to Marijuana" and "Getting a Low-Cost Legal Abortion" as well as other more conventional articles.

--Joseph Sinclair

For the whole there is no right or wrong, since it lives and develops through the interplay of forces, and in the universe, too, good and evil finally act together productively.

-- Paul Klee
1921
Cook Inn Toastmasters is the oldest law school organization. Through the years, it has continued to serve two prime functions. First, Toastmasters provides an informal opportunity for students to practice and improve their public speaking skills, in an atmosphere of familiarity and congeniality. Lawyers are often called upon to moderate meetings and speak to groups, and it is invaluable for all future practitioners to have some ability to handle these situations with confidence. Toastmasters offers practice in delivering prepared texts as well as in speaking extemporaneously. Meetings every Thursday allow ample opportunity for improvement, and encourage every member to develop his own confidence and style.

Cook Inn Toastmasters also seeks to provide a weekly social function unlike that offered elsewhere in the law school. Thursday evening meetings offer an excellent steak dinner with wine, served in a quiet, pleasant manner. Membership includes students from all three classes, and past graduates now practicing, so that much useful information on courses, professors, and practice is exchanged. Law school professors are invited on a monthly basis to broaden the students' contacts with the faculty, beyond the strict classroom situation. When important issues of state, national, or worldwide importance arise, a discussion program is instituted to allow for group participation. The meeting of November 5 discussed the results of the recent election for national and state public officers.

Toastmasters meets every Thursday evening throughout the year in the Faculty Dining Room at 5 p.m. All law students are warmly encouraged to come and attend a meeting, so that they may realize for themselves the benefits of the Cook Inn Toastmasters.

Robert G. Kuhbach
Vice President, Cook Inn Toastmasters

LANDLORDS LOSING
LEGAL BATTLES
Looking over the record of recent court cases and new state legislation regarding the landlord-tenant relationship, legal observers almost unanimously conclude that the landlord is steadily losing ground.

The trend is clear. In case after case, judges are reversing ancient property law doctrines by deciding that tenants have new rights and landlords have new responsibilities. The most far-reaching decisions thus far have concerned apartments with housing code violations: Landlords can no longer evict tenants who withhold rent on a building which has housing code violations. Nor can a landlord evict a tenant who reports a housing code violation to authorities. These decisions mainly apply to low-income tenants living in deteriorated or substandard housing.

Other cases now being tested in the courts would win new rights for middle- and upper-income tenants. One such case hopes to establish that a landlord must bargain collectively with his tenants to negotiate rent increases. Another seeks to nullify standard lease clauses such as waivers of liability, repair rights and confessions of judgment. A third would require landlords to pay interest to tenants on their security deposits.

In state legislatures, the trend is in the same direction. Some are enacting repair-and-deduct statutes. New Jersey, for example, now permits tenants to make repairs themselves under certain conditions and to deduct the cost from their rent. Many other states are enacting laws which prohibit retaliatory eviction for joining a tenant union. Eviction procedures themselves, once a quick, cut-and-dried legal routine, are becoming more complex as new tenant "defenses to eviction" are enunciated. Rent control, virtually dead since World War II, is a new reality in Miami and Boston, and is being considered in many other places, such as California and New Jersey.

The Environmental Law Society of the University of Chicago Law School is conducting a day-long course in Pollution Law on Saturday, November 21, 1970 from 9 A.M. to 5 P.M. The Michigan ELS invites any interested law student to participate in this course. Details of the course are available in Room 234 Hutchins Hall.
"Law school today is a cross between a meat inspection plant, stamping some "highly approved", some "approved" and some "approved with reservations", and an employment agency. It should perform neither function".

With this, Prof. Joe Sax, speaking from the floor, branded the entire Conference on Examinations proceeding, Tuesday and Wednesday nights, October 22 and 23, as a travesty and an abomination. Those who attended, having torn themselves away from grooming for inspection, were treated to this first glimmer of sanity in our meat stamping plant.

The conference began with a paper by Prof. Frank Coen on Tuesday. He outlined a justification of and methodology for examinations in the law school. He suggested that exams were useful as prods to student diligence, but that their full benefit could not be conveyed until they reflected an attempt at "creative problem solving", with positive informational feedback to the individual subjected to the test.

On Wednesday, the Conference continued with a panel discussion, purportedly on Coen's report. The panel, consisting of Profs. Blasi, Kamisar, and White and senior Jason Horton, began a dissection of the examination process which lasted until Prof. Sax rang in truth. The report itself was generally characterized as unmindful of the peculiar problems attendant upon teaching the law. There was also a rebuttal of Coen's conclusions from the floor. The student, spurred by what appears an intramural dispute in psychology, characterized Coen's conclusions as "immoral".

The panel discussion provided evidence of a fundamental split on the faculty between those who see this as a trade school, providing legal technicians to the monitored roofs of the law factories, and those to whom the law is a philosophical experience, readying its disciples for an ivy-covered life in ivory halls. However, membership in either camp did not dictate a response to Coen. Members of the factory approach, which evidently include White and Kamisar, responded differently. White, clearly buoyed by Coen's suggestion for more exams, generally approved. Kamisar, pleading that he had no time for such grading and that there is relatively little the professor can do for the students anyway, generally rejected Coen's conclusions.

On the other side, Blasi and Horton seemed closer in their cautious approval of Coen. Horton pointed out that the present procedure fails to meaningfully differentiate in the 2.6-3.4 range, an area comprising approximately 70% of the student body, and yet the employment agency process takes them as absolutely valid. The result is, even if the grade point average of the school is skewed higher, no useful distinctions can be made. He said that if the examination process cannot provide valuable ordinal differentiation by some application of Coen's concepts, then it should cease pretending to do so and be eliminated. Blasi confined himself to an evaluation of the means by which Coen's recommendations could be achieved within the present context of grade differentiation. He reflected favorably on the special college concept being tried in the freshman class and suggested use of seniors, graduate students, and class peers to resolve the resource problem inherent in an increased feedback environment.

All the panelists revealed that they were disappointed by the failure of the students, the meat of the inspection, to appear and object. They suggested that significant student response would create a desire for change with the faculty, but that such response as seen indicates a satisfaction with present procedures.

The last word must go to Yale Kamisar. In a subsequent interview he confided: "No matter what we do the students would not be happy. If we have more exams, within five years the students would complain that they cannot study because they are always preparing for exams". So, nothing is done because, as the 94% of the student body who did not appear have shown, everybody's happy.

---Joel Newman
Students as a class possess more energy, idealism, resources and resourcefulness than any other identifiable societal segment. Yet they find that their values are not reflected in the society in which they live. They protest and demonstrate, but the student movement, by definition, is cyclical—it always dissolves during the summers and at exam time—and lacks the expertise which would allow it to focus on any specific problem in an effective way (demonstrations on the courthouse steps have shown themselves to be notably lacking in influence on the ultimate decision in a given case). Not surprisingly, this mode of activity has effected no important social change.

If students (or any other identifiable interest group) are to make their collective voice heard where it counts, a change of tactics is clearly required. The Public Interest Research Group, sponsored by Ralph Nader, is suggesting at campuses across the country that an exciting new concept be implemented. This idea manifests the obvious resolution of the inadequacies in the student movement—the hiring of full-time professionally skilled persons to press student interests in the courts, the legislatures, and elsewhere. Basically, the scheme uses highly skilled lawyers and other professionals, such as engineers and ecologists, on the side of the environmentalist and the consumer needful of protection. The public is unrepresented in the circles where policy is made. The student-sponsored public interest firm, however, can alter that imbalance. It can inject into decision-making the consideration which is so obviously absent—it can require that the social cost of investment be treated as the crucial factor it is.

The critical mass required in any such firm, if it is to have impact, is 10-15 members—six to eight lawyers combined with a balance of ecologists, engineers, social scientists and others. The funding needed is $150,000 to $300,000 per year. There are about eight million college students in the U.S.—by taxing themselves only $2 per semester (a minimal increment over their present payment of tuition and fees), $32 million could be generated. This is enough money, at a nominal cost to each student, to establish more than 100 groups of public interest professionals. The possibility of making the adversary system a reality is therefore clearly before us.

Students in Oregon are now engaged in a campaign to set up their version of this concept. Within the month, referenda will be held at Portland State University, University, Oregon State University, Lewis & Clark, and Willamette. Organizations dedicated to the holding of similar referenda are now working at Oregon Technical Institute and many other smaller schools. By voting in favor of the proposition on these campuses, the students will be voluntarily increasing their incidental fees by $1 per student per quarter. They will be dictating that this money be turned over to a student-elected and -controlled board whose job it will be to hire and direct the full-time professionals. All available indications are that the propositions will pass overwhelmingly at schools with a composite population of well over 50,000—yielding on a three-quarter/year basis, at least $150,000 with which the group
called the Oregon Public Interest Group (OPIRG) will be funded.

Clearly, the measure, even if passed at all the schools in the state, must be approved by the State Board of Higher Education. It seems unlikely, though, that the Board would deny students this opportunity to work within the system for change. The very essence of the proposal is one of rationality. The students of Oregon will be asking for what they learned in civics class was their right--asking for an effective voice in the councils of government--the same voice that industries and other special interest groups alone now have.

Oregon seems destined to be the first state in which this effort will bear tangible fruit. However, Washington, Minnesota, Georgia, California, Colorado and Connecticut each have small groups working toward a similar goal. The realization is there that this scheme presents an eminently viable method which can be employed to achieve the kinds of long-range broad social reforms students see as so desperately needed. Combined with the advent of the 18-year-old vote, success seems inevitable.

--Donald Ross
NYU Law School '70

ATTENTION: Sabbatical-Bound Professors

Ralph Nader is seeking law school faculty members who are planning quarter, semester or year long leaves of absence to work with his Public Interest Research Group in Washington, D.C. The pay is minimal, the work voluminous, the office decor early Salvation Army!

The compensations: Ralph Nader is at the cutting edge of a not-so-quiet legal revolution. Working with the Public Interest Research Group provides the opportunity to make a substantial contribution to the growth and stature of public interest law. It also provides a period of almost complete freedom--time to pursue an area of special interest free of the pressure of class preparation, and with the benefits of independence of choice and judgement and the "rejuvenating" atmosphere of Washington, D.C.

The Public Interest Research Group is presently made up of ten recent law graduates, three experienced attorneys, and one law professor on a year's sabbatical. Each has an area of special interest. The work takes many forms--litigation, publication, Congressional testimony, new course materials, and so on.

Come work in the nerve center of public interest law! For more information write: John Spanogle, Public Interest Research Group, 1025 15th St., N.W. Suite 601, Washington, D.C.

Anyone interested in attending the Atomic Energy Commission hearings on the Consumers Power Palisades Nuclear Power Plant (near South Haven, Michigan) please sign the list posted in the Environmental Law Society's office (234 HH). The hearings will continue the weeks of November 9 and 16.

Editor: Roger Tilles
Associate Editor: Tom Jennings
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The Law School could learn a lot from Elmo Zumwalt.

Elmo Zumwalt is the Chief of Naval Operations (highest ranking Navy admiral), and although he has been C.N.O. for only four months, the 49 year-old admiral has instituted a number of changes in the tradition and status-conscious Navy.

Since the Law School is also a tradition and status-conscious institution, it might well benefit from a study of the reforms instituted by Zumwalt, and perhaps institute corresponding reforms in the Law School.

The most popular change instituted has been for Zumwalt himself (read Dean or Ombudsman of the Law School) to go around to various installations (classrooms) to listen to the complaints of servicemen, and has been especially responsive to the traditions that demean low-ranking personnel (students). He has also instituted "retention study groups"--personnel from various areas who spend a week at the Pentagon to exchange grievances, then present them to Zumwalt in an hour-long session. In most cases, the wives were also invited to make suggestions.

This is no mere "step-into my office and tell me about it" (and nothing will happen). Of 800 orders calling for reactions from selected commands, 65% have resulted in direct orders from Zumwalt to effect changes in the service. They are aimed mainly at eliminating many seemingly minor, but unsettling irritations of Navy life. The best-known order is one limiting the time spent in line waiting for anything to 15 minutes.

Zumwalt is described as an eclectic thinker who prefers reading contemporary political, sociological and technical works to military history. He argues that the key to a strong, effective Navy (Law School) is the kind of intelligent and motivated manpower it can attract, rather than its machines (library, etc.).

The thought of having such a person for a Dean boggles the mind. (Or having such an Ombudsman in the Law School--though even the thought of an Ombudsman boggles the mind.) How unusual it would be if someone in the power structure of the Law School would actually care enough about students to actually do something to make the Law School less demeaning. It's fairly easy
to talk to people here—if you go through channels and get an appointment—but getting beyond the talking stage is almost impossible for the student population. Heaven forbid that a student suggestion be adopted merely because it's a good idea or because it will make the Law School work better. (This is another area in which Admiral Zumwalt wins high praise—his willingness to try new, innovative ideas for accomplishing age-old Navy roles).

Imagine if a student could go to an administrator with an idea, and have it implemented in the operation of the Law School instead of being met with 'reasons' why such a thing can't be done or 'studying' the proposal to death.

It's not like the Law School didn't have any problems. Any student who has tried to take an active role in fashioning his own education can testify that such attempts are exercises in futility. (And as the R.G. has pointed out previously—well over a month ago—there are locked faculty restrooms on nearly every floor of Hutchins Hall (for no apparent reason), the only remedy necessary being that they be unlocked.)

There is no dearth of problems to be solved around the Law School. There is no lack of solutions. What is lacking is an individual capable of or a process for, implementing those solutions.

M.D.M.

CONGRATULATIONS

Thanks go to Assistant Dean Kuklin from the whole student body for the excellent and efficient new registration and classification procedure. Now if all the man hours saved by the new system could be used constructively......
DATE OF INTERVIEW: Friday, December 1, 1967

FIRM: Sullivan, Weiss, Wasp & Wealth (also Insurance, Real Estate, Notary Public)

ADDRESS: 40th Floor, Zekendorf Towers (under construction) N.Y., N.Y.

INTERVIEWER(S): Erwin Smigel, I. V. Torquemada

DESCRIPTION OF FIRM: The firm is engaged in the general practice of law. It was founded by Langdell Austin Ames in 1804, shortly before his disbarment. At present, the firm is composed of 175 lawyers, of whom 8 are partners. All the partners are direct descendents of Langdell Austin Ames.

The firm's general law practice is general in nature. That is, many different types of problems are handled in many different ways, generally for the most part, so to speak. The practice runs the whole gamut, from corporate law to corporate law. Particular emphasis is placed on rich clients. The firm also handles labor problems (on the side of the employer), finance problems (on the side of the banks) and theological problems (on the side of the angels).

Although the firm is somewhat departmentalized, members avoid specialization. In the course of a single week, a partner may handle 43 separate types of Blue Sky cases. Occasionally, the firm takes on a criminal law case, to provide variety. Almost as frequently, the dead are resurrected and the waters of the Nile are parted. Unless it occurs in our waiting room, the firm does not handle automobile accident cases or paternity suits.

A young attorney joining the firm will be given a wide opportunity to handle many different types of cases. As he sits in the library, researching securities cases, he is encouraged to leaf through the other cases in the West Reporter Series, during his lunch hour, to see what is going on in other branches of the law. It is the policy of the firm to give young lawyers responsibility of their own. It is not unusual for a man who has been with the firm only a few years to be entrusted with the parking of a partner's car. Most of a newcomer's time, of course, will be spent in polishing up the handle on the big brass door.

The firm is interested in men of character and ability. Grades are considered as strong evidence of such ability. However, grades are not the only consideration. Those applicants who are not on the Law Review will also be judged on their ability to spin straw into gold.

Interested students are invited to sign their names in blood at the Placement Office, no later than Midnight. In case of tie, the entry with the earliest postmark will win. The decision of the judges is final. Those not accepted are cordially invited to hurl themselves from the nearest cliff.

Posting date: September 18, 1970
Removal date: December 1, 1970
Football Poll

Is it possible, sports fans, to elevate one's self to the top of the heap twice in one season? Is it possible to win the laurel wreath with all of the justifiable accolades that go with it two weeks in a row? Well, young budding lawyers out there in LAW LAND, the wizard from Wabash couldn't do it. Neither could the Princetonian gentleman. But Big Bob Jaspen rose to the occasion last week with a remarkable 82.5% to race away from all would-be challengers. Bob was excited, to say the least, and when told of his incredible feat, he asked when the next baseball poll would be. Not for a while, Bob. Not for a while. You won't have Ralph Branca to kick around anymore!" was the best you former literary intellects could produce, and so this week we appeal to your scientific-like minds. As you see, we have given point spread for each game. The tie breaker, then, will be-- "How many total points, in absolute value, will your Fearless Prognosticators be off? Season's Percentage—a real steady 76%.

-- The Hammer Twins

1. IOWA and 35 vs. Michigan Warm-up for Woody.
2. AIR FORCE and 10 vs. Stanford Plunkett's bombs ground Flyboys.
3. WILLIAMS and a cool 50 vs. Amherst Bring on the Lambert Cup.
4. ARMY and 15 vs. Oregon "East is East, and West is West..."
5. GEORGIA and 22 vs. Auburn Ask Bill Barwick.
6. CORTLAND STATE and 19 vs. Central Conn. St. If you can touch it, you can catch it.
7. COAST GUARD and 10 vs. Lebanon Valley E pluribus unum.
8. PENN and 3 vs. Columbia Caveat Emptor.
9. GEORGIA TECH and 35 vs. Notre Dame "Barz gains 4 yards."
10. NORFOLK STATE and 30 vs Grambling Do it.
11. HOLY CROSS and 12 vs. Rutgers Beware of hepatitis.
12. KANSAS and 7 vs. Oklahoma Corn fields quiver.
13. MIAMI (FLA) and 25 vs. Alabama Bear's brawlers run roughshod.
15. PURDUE and 24 vs. Ohio State It doesn't count until next week.
16. PRINCETON and 14 vs Yale Toothless Tigers beat their gums.
17. TRINITY and 6 vs. Wesleyan Birds end mediocre season.
18. WEST VIRGINIA and 18 vs Syracuse 'Cuse bowl-bound.
19. UCLA and 7 vs. Washington Sonny--Heisman in '72
20. UTAH and 21 vs. Arizona State ....did gyre and gimbal in the wabe.