In the Philadelphia trial opening next week of Steven Fraser and Richard Borgmann, on the charge of possessing explosives with intent to use, there exists the possibility of a police frame-up, in which event a conviction in the case would deal a serious blow to American civil liberties. In Ann Arbor, a Fraser-Borgmann Defense Committee has been set up and is beginning to organize educational and fund-raising activities. Also faculty members are being asked to participate by supporting a call for a National Commission of Inquiry. One of the sponsors here is Professor Joseph Sax. Others who have signed a statement calling for evidence as to the guilt or innocence of both defendants and police in the incident are Paul O'Dwyer, Dick Gregory, and Kate Millet.

BACKGROUND

Borgmann and Fraser are leaders of the Labor Committee of Philadelphia. The Committee, originally part of the SDS, has always been opposed in their principles to the violent aims of the protest movement. It has since its inception advocated exactly the opposite approach from the Weatherman-type factions which caused it to split from SDS in 1969. Their approach has been peaceful, mass popular actions in support of demands for better education, decent housing, adequate health care, etc., with emphasis on appealing to broad layers of the population on the basis of...
common interest demands. They try non-
violently to offer a coalescing influence
to students, blacks, working-poor whites
and others who see a change in society
as beneficial to their interests.

The Labor Committee had been instrumental
in the non-obstructive sit in at the
University of Pennsylvania (praised
even by that school's President for
its non-violent nature, in contrast to
all other actions taken by SDS that year)
which was demanding that the University
trustees provide housing for all com-
community residents forced out of their
homes by the expansion of a University
supported research Center.

Having led a powerful movement (even
though the strike was eventually un-
successful, the Labor Committee had
shown that students and the community
could combine in a meaningful movement)
Fraser and Borgmann became the subjects
of harassment from the Philadelphia
city leaders, who warned of the group's
"anarchist" and "violent" tendencies.

On the evening of April 9, 1969, eight
members of the Philadelphia Civil Dis-
obedience Squad entered the apartment of
Fraser and Borgmann with a warrant to
search for explosives. The following
events, although disputed by the police,
have been confirmed to this reporter by
a reliable on the scene witness. Within
ten minutes reporters and cameramen from
the Philadelphia Group W television
station arrived at the door, and over
Fraser's objections, were admitted by
police. After a complete search of the
apartment, the CD men suddenly con-
verged in the kitchen. Forming a
tight semi-circle around the refrigera-
tor, effectively blocking Fraser's
view, they then lifted the refrigera-
tor off the floor and produced three
lengths of pipe claiming they had found
them under the appliance. The refrigera-
tor bottom, however, was entirely
flush with the floor. Then, reaching
behind the refrigerator, the men pro-
duced a candy tin which contained plas-
tique used in bomb making. Moments later
a length of fuse was produced off the
floor. The television cameramen filmed
the whole incident or at least as much
of it as he was told to by police.

When the film was subpoenaed as evidence
of the event for the defendant's, Group
W reported that it was lost, and could
not be used. Nor were any fingerprints
taken on the evidence. When official
police photographs showed the fuses put
into place in the pipes, the police ad-
mited putting them there in the station.

For the next eighteen months the DA's
office did nothing—Fraser and Borgmann
were not even indicted. Earlier this
month on November 4 indictments were
finally returned against the pair. It
has been mentioned that the police now
believe the country to be in the right
mood to render a guilty verdict popular.

ANN ARBOR JOINS THE CASE

This week people across the entire
country have moved to join the battle
to present a fair picture of what
happened. A Fraser-Borgmann Defense
Committee was set up. A number of law
students are involved in this committee's
work, which is to press for increased
education of the public, and to arouse
interest in the proposed National Commis-
sion of Inquiry. This Commission will
be constituted of "intellectually honest"
people, many of whom holding antithetical
views from the ones Borgmann and Fraser
hold. Their goal is to independently hear
and judge evidence from all sides, and
by doing so also judge police action, as
well as Fraser and Borgmann's alleged
crime. The Commission will be similar
to the Dewey Commission in 1937, which
tried Trotsky for his crimes at the same
time he was being smeared in Russia, and
here came to an opposite conclusion.

(Continued on page 8)
Prof. Martin: meet the man a metamathematician

Jim Martin, 26, is one of the bright young newcomers to the Law School's teaching faculty. Himself a recent product of Michigan Law (1969 graduate), with all of the suitable academic credentials, Martin is this semester teaching Commercial Transactions and Civil Procedure, his law school specialty. Not only has he chosen what this writer considers to be a tough pair of courses to teach but he carries the heaviest student-hour load (number of students taught X number of credit hours) of any member of the faculty.

Martin's academic background includes a bachelors degree from the University of Illinois and a masters degree in math from the University of Michigan. In commenting upon the relation between his training in mathematics and law he found very little, except for a feeling that a scientific as opposed to a general or social science background, makes for an easier acceptance and understanding of areas of the law where precise legal reasoning rather than "result orientation" still reigns. You might ask what Prof. Martin did between his 1969 graduation and the present. To dispel the burgeoning rumor that he fought in the mercenary forces in Africa let it be said that, to the contrary, he indulged in the considerably less homicidal occupation of clerking for Judge Levanthal of the D.C. Circuit where he met the girl-next-door to whom he recently became engaged and will marry next May. I might remark at this point that the above rumor is rivaled only by those that assert that Prof. St. Antoine himself wrote that remarkable Coif Labor Law Can, and that Prof. Kamisar is shy.

Outside interests in which Jim Martin dabbles include metamathematics (don't ask), the reading of science fiction, and the cooking of meals which would not yet awe the Continent's royalty but which has already won him $5 for the "recipe of the day" from the Chicago Tribune. Next semester he will be teaching Conflict of Laws and will be acting Director for Foreign students while Whit Gray is away. If you want to know more about Prof. Martin or the things he knows about his office is 1031 Legal Research.
GM - a campaign against a GIANT

General Motors Corporation is not a business: it is a worldwide institution with political, social and economic impact on millions of people everywhere. Unlike most other far reaching institutions, however, GM is governed by invisible men, men insulated from the pressures of public interest to which other decision-makers are subject. They are not accountable to their shareholders, to the consumers who purchase their products, to the communities in which their plants are located.

Campaign GM has 3 major proposals to deal with this problem. The goal is to make the world's largest corporation responsible to the people it serves.

The first proposal concerns shareholder democracy. Under the present system, shareholders have no choice in the selection of directors as GM sends proxy statements listing only management's nominees. Theoretically, shareholders can nominate others but the cost of doing this in a company as vast as GM is impossible. Only a handful of GM's 1.3 million shareholders attend the annual meeting where nominations may be made and most of the proxy voting is done prior to that time. This proposal would require GM to list both management's nominees and the candidates nominated by non-management shareholders on its proxy. Non-management candidates would be nominated by shareholders on its petitions and would be entitled to have supporting statements printed in the proxy statement. These provisions would transform the selection of GM's directors into a valid election with a resultant shareholder control of the company.

Proposal II - GM's directors have a responsibility broader than the company and its shareholders. All giant corporations have many constituencies -- many groups deeply affected by company decisions and policies. These groups must be given a more meaningful role in the corporations' decision-making process. Our second proposal would be a first step in that direction. It would permit three of GM's most important constituencies -- employees, GM dealers and GM consumers -- to participate in the election of three of the company's directors. By petition, members of these constituencies would nominate candidates to be listed on a ballot distributed by GM to all constituency members. The winners of the three elections would then be placed on GM's proxy statement and the shareholders asked to approve them.

Proposal III - If constituencies and shareholders are to make valid judgments about GM's role in society and about the company's direction and management they need certain basic information. Campaign GM's third proposal calls for
disclosures on minority hirings, air pollution, and auto safety policies. It would require the publication in the annual report of statistics to indicate the amounts of money and numbers of employees GM assigns to programs in each of these areas, the details of all GM vehicle recall campaigns resulting from safety or pollution control defects, descriptions of any new safety or pollution control techniques that GM has developed, and figures showing the proportion of minority employees in each of nine job categories ranging from professionals to unskilled labor.

While Round II of Campaign GM did not change the makeup of GM shareholders, it was successful in starting a great public debate on the question of corporate responsibility, and in getting major foundations and universities to reevaluate their investments in General Motors.

Organizations like Campaign GM can be carried out elsewhere, particularly on the college campus. A great deal of work remains to be done and students can do it. For further information on campus organization contact Nancy Mills, University Coordinator, Project on Corporate Responsibility, 1609 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

--- Susan Gross
Project on Corporate Responsibility

**LAW JOBS FOR FRESHMEN**

If you are a freshman law student looking for a law related job in Ann Arbor for the summer -- they are scarce, but available. Unfortunately there has not been a great deal of enthusiasm among the members of the Washtenaw County Bar Association to establish a placement service. While last spring a resolution was passed to organize a central file of applications at Shankland, Hiller, McCormick and Barnett, 600 City Center Building, to the best of my knowledge I was the only law student to learn of the resolution and mine was the only application on file. Possibly, concerted effort by the law school community could improve the situation.

All three title companies have hired summer assistants in the past as have the Circuit Court Judges and the Judge of Probate. It might also be advisable to check with the District Court Judges at City Hall. As for finding a clerkship with an attorney, the best method is to type up a resume, get a copy of the yellow pages and start knocking on doors. This is because there are a large number of lawyers in Ann Arbor and business conditions determine which hire clerks -- therefore there is no set pattern as to which firms hire.

Through a fortuitous circumstance I obtained a clerkship with a solo practitioner in Ann Arbor. The job has entailed a substantial amount of research in probate, real estate, tax, and partnership law as well as a first hand view of law office management.

Good hunting and good luck.

--- William F. Martson, Jr.
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The following proposal for student participation in faculty meetings has been passed by the Board of Directors. The proposal merely seeks to end secret decision making by the faculty and provide for a student voice on every issue decided by the faculty. Many other Law Schools including the University of Kansas, provide for substantial voting student representation in faculty decisions. This proposal does not go that far. Currently student members of the student-faculty committee may be present when the faculty discusses proposals of their committees. However many important decisions made by the faculty involving allocation of law school resources, research policy, etc., do not come through the committees. Moreover, the student committee members are speaking as experts rather than as representatives of the student body.

This proposal was originally made by the Board of Directors last October, at which time the faculty referred it to a committee chaired by Prof. John Reed. The committee has not acted on the proposal.

THE PROPOSAL

To the faculty:

The Board of Directors requests that two additional non-voting parties be admitted to faculty meetings at all times:

1. A member of the Board of Directors, to be chosen on a rotating basis, who, as a representative of the Law School student body, shall have full rights of discussion; and

2. A member of the staff of the Res Gestae whose participation shall be limited to questions of clarification.

The Board of Directors requests that discussions held by the faculty in Executive Session shall be summarized in writing for the Board.

The Board firmly believes that these measures are crucial to the effective fulfillment of its functions and effective student participation in the decision making procedure of the Law School.

The Board requests that this motion be considered at the next faculty meeting and if rejected by the faculty, that the reasons for such rejection be clearly stated for publication to the Law School community.

This proposal does not intend to exclude representation of special student interest groups from attending faculty meetings as had been the practice in the past.

BOARD TAKES ACTION ON BOOKSTORE, LOUNGES

During the past several weeks the Board of Directors has discussed and acted upon two items that, judging from the Res Gestae and the general law school rumor mill, seem to be of interest to a number of law students. The first is the question of the $5 assessed all law students by the University Cellar Bookstore, while the second involves the rehabilitation of the student lounges.

In regard to the $5 assessment, it was found that there were three major hurdles in making the fee of any value to law students. The first, the reluctance of the bookstore to undertake the stocking of law texts, has happily been overcome. After an initial burst of pessimism the staff of the bookstore has expended a great deal of time and energy in attempting to provide this service. The second hurdle, the reluctance of the major publishers to distribute to the bookstore, has also even more happily been overcome. The initial opposition of West is well demonstrated by their letter to the manager of the bookstore.

"For many years our company has enjoyed a most satisfactory relationship with the Overbeck Bookstore which has handled the
President Fleming on Sex Discrimination

President Fleming makes his position clear: "the eradication of sexual discrimination in employment presents more serious problems for enforcement agencies than for employers (AA News 8/30/70) and (same article) "in professional fields the personnel is overwhelmingly male, and that is the preference of the market." President Fleming's market is the one we're concerned with. Further, he claims he deplores the "social attitude that blocks the hiring of women and says that management hesitancy (to hire women) can be traced to their record of leaving the labor market during the child-rearing years." In this respect, President Fleming shows himself to be as ignorant as the "social attitude" he so deplores. Public Health Service studies show that on the average men actually lose more days from work per year because of disability than women (including days lost because of pregnancy and childbirth). As for job turnover rates, a recent publication by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission states that job status is the key factor—low status jobs have higher turnover rates for both men and women.

What we resent most is the hypocrisy of persons like Mr. Fleming, who view themselves as informed and reasonable people, yet consistently refuse to avail themselves of the knowledge that might upset their values and basic assumptions. It is imperative that administrators in positions of power take the initiative to first educate themselves to the facts and then to see to it that lower level administrators and staff be made aware and mandated to change their behavior to more constructive patterns.

--from PROBE memo to women staff, faculty and students

A Pro Forma Eulogy Not

Cheeks glowed red and eyes twinkled as one arm jerkily shot up into the air, as though controlled by some invisible puppeteer "ANY LIFE IN BEING".

Many of us will remember Dean Julin for different reasons. I will remember him for performing a feat which few could have managed and which few of the student body are even aware. Dean Allen appointed him to chair the Special Admissions Committee and the Board of Directors appointed him the problem of Ed Fabre, David Lewis, Ralph Jones, and David A. Goldstein, student members. It would be a compliment to say he survived. He did more; he triumphed. He triumphed because he disavowed the administrator's favorite (riot evoking) ploy -- listen, sympathize, impose unilaterally your own values. He listened carefully, he sympathized in earnest and then did what few can -- adjusted his own values so that an amalgamation of the group values emerged -- faculty as well as student.

When others are claiming victory by responding, "well, the law school's still standing, isn't it", Dean Julin's victories include: a special admissions committee which was a model of what student-faculty committees must be -- one based upon full equality and mutual respect, admission of more than fifty minority group more qualified and more carefully selected than any group in the past, faculty acquiescence if not recognition that the times they are a changin'... and, by the way, the law school is still standing.

The usual final paragraph is supposed to read: we at Michigan shall miss you, Dean Julin, and wish you success as Dean of the University of Florida Law School. I don't know what "we" shall do, but I shall miss you and it is certain that this law school will be worse for your absence.

--David A. Goldstein
distribution of all of our law school teaching materials on the Michigan campus. As you know, the Overbeck Bookstore has done an excellent job in servicing the Michigan Law School. In view of this fact, we are not presently inclined to open additional bookstore outlets on the Michigan campus.

"There are several reasons why we would prefer to handle the distribution of our law school publications through one bookstore rather than through a number of bookstores. We have found from long experience that when several bookstores are servicing one law school, service to the law school is usually less satisfactory and a great deal of duplicate over-ordering and over-stocking results.

"In view of the fact that we do have a well-run consignment agency currently operating on the Michigan campus, we are not presently inclined to open an additional consignment agency on campus."

A timely intervention by Professor Kamisar on behalf of the bookstore, however, caused them to re-evaluate and ultimately change their policy. The final hurdle is the difficulty in determining accurately the initial stock necessary for January. To this end, all students have been sent a list of books and a letter outlining a mechanism by which they can facilitate this determination. It is urged that all students cooperate in what will amount to a minimum of 9% off the list price on all law books.

In regard to the condition of the student lounges: the outlook is also reasonably bright. The upstairs lounge of the Law Club, pursuant to a plan evolved at the beginning of this year, will shortly be completely renovated. The funds for this were acquired from a source outside the Law School. In the basement of the law club the addition of several fixtures have greatly added to the happiness of the community (and the wealth of the treasury) but have resulted in the constructive eviction of those who care to watch TV.

As a result, along with new chairs, carpet, etc. a sound proof partition will be constructed across the end of the lounge. The "capital" expenditures involved will be financed by the generous, adept, and "now you see it, now you don't" budget balancing of Max Smith.

The Lounge in Hutchins Hall, despite the pictures of the 1890 Supreme Court is in obvious need of rehabilitation. New chairs and carpeting are not unforeseeable in the near future. The problem of what food facilities are to be made available is something that those who use the lounge regularly should decide if a viable alternative to the apparent extremes of nothing and Joe Sinclair's idea of a hot buffet is arrived at, the Board will certainly pursue it. In the meantime, when the estimate is completed and hopefully approved, the lounge will at least be brought up to a law student's minimum standard of living.

David LeFevre
President, Lawyers Club
Board of Directors

(continued from page 2)

Professor Sax has joined the call for such a commission and the faculty is presently being asked for their support. Student support for the Defense Committee is also being sought by Peter Rush (769-6557). A meeting will be held Sunday night at a time and place to be announced.

Res Gestae hopes to provide its readers with extended coverage of the trial.

-- Roger Tilles

Upcoming Colloquium in Grand Rapids

There will be a one-day seminar about the new Michigan Administrative Procedures Act on December 11 in Grand Rapids. The seminar, sponsored by the Institute of Continuing Legal Education (ICLE) will include sessions on Public Disclosure, Rulemaking Procedures, and Judicial Review and will feature Professors Cramton and Carrington of our faculty. For further information, the ICLE office is located on the fourth floor of Hutchins Hall.
To the Editor:

In response to a recent letter by Mr. Pete Kelly, the majority members of the Board of Directors would like to clarify our recent action in regard to the ROTC Governing Board. We do not believe, as Mr. Kelly seems to think, that there is no purpose to be served by a ROTC program. We do feel that the University should not support this program. At the present the University subsidizes ROTC by providing buildings, faculty and curriculum status, and actively soliciting students and prospective students for ROTC programs. The most significant subsidy is the recognition by the University of ROTC as a valid and recommended activity for University students. It is the feeling of the Board that the subsidies provided by the University and the persuasive weight of the University's approval of such military training upon incoming students and the society in general, destroys the necessary neutrality that the University must maintain to protect its role as an academic institution.

We understand that ROTC operates in other University communities in precisely this manner.

However the countervailing feeling was that the University is an inappropriate forum for the training of men in the so called "arts of war."

Mr. Kelly refers to the Board's function that of representing "the interests of the entire law school community." Although in the best of all possible worlds a referendum on every issue would be the ideal, we have been constituted as a representative body and as such the mandate given us in the election is that we are to study, debate and decide upon the issues before us. This request from the President came directly to our body, as the representative of law students, and we met our obligation by researching the issue, participating in a lengthy debate, making a decision, and then communicating that decision to the student body. (It might be noted here that the six members of the Board who have been or are now associated with the armed forces or ROTC, four supported the motion.)

The process does not stop here. As Mr. Kelly has demonstrated, dissenting students have a forum in the Res Gestae, or in attending our regular open, Monday evening meetings in the Faculty Dining Room. Any law student may bring a matter before us for either consideration of his original idea or reconsideration of a issue previously debated by the Board. If satisfaction is not then obtained, the student may initiate either a referendum on the issue or a recall of Board members with whom he is dissatisfied. These procedures are designed to insure all possible democratic representation for the law student. On this specific issue, our decision was sincerely made with the law student in mind, and our conclusion, after extensive thought and discussion, was quietly and deliberately made without any taint of the fervor of revolutionary rhetoric.

--Don Tucker
Tom Brookover
WIMPHY GOLDEN: A Discrimination case

Placement history was made today at the University of Michigan Law School Office as Wimpy Golden became the first dog in history to interview for a job. This reporter was granted an exclusive interview recently with the remarkable dog.

RES GESTAE: How were you able to obtain an interview, Wimpy, I understand the Placement Office is a tightly run ship?

WIMPHY: That's true. I had quite a hassle with a certain Miss Ransford (the Placement Director) because, as you know she has placed a definite limit on interviews for dogs and second-year students. I was able to eventually schedule an interview by going over her head to the Rector of Room 200, a Mr. Linden. (When asked if he identified with Mr. Linden because of the latter's shaggy appearance, Wimpy declined to answer.)

RG: How did your interview go, Wimpy?

WIMPHY: Well at first I was nervous uptight. I am very self-conscious, you know.

RG: Because you're a dog?

WIMPHY: No, because I'm not Law Review.

RG: I see, that is a handicap.

WIMPHY: Yes it is. Furthermore, a lot of law firms engage in de facto discrimination against dogs.

RG: How is that?

WIMPHY: Well, they'll be very nice to you when you see them, you know, pat your head, take you out for Burger-Bits, but at home at the dinner table, they tell "mutt" jokes.

RG: Are all firms like that?

WIMPHY: Well, some engage in a bit of tokenism. You know, hire a dog, put him up near the office door. But what's worse is they assume that because you're canine you could only aspire to be a watchdog. They can't handle it when a dog wants to become a lawyer.

RG: Even though a lot of lawyers are real dogs?

WIMPHY: Watch it.

RG: Sorry. One final question. Exactly which firms do you have in mind to interview with?

WIMPHY: I see Purina tomorrow and I'm on standby for Hartz Mountain.
EDITORIAL

Hail to the Chief Justice

In order to speed the slow moving processes of justice in our nation's courts, Chief Justice Burger in Philadelphia Saturday suggested the elimination of juries in most civil cases. Burger did say, at the same time, that he believes jury trials should be retained in criminal cases.

It might seem foolish, for one so far removed from the realities of the poor as Chief Justice Burger, that the real screwing of the poor comes more from unscrupulous businessmen and unresponsive corporations than from police and G-men, who "only" attack the one segment of the poor who view subsistence as a right and over-indulgence as a wrong. Even as to defendants in criminal cases, though, Judge Burger has the worst record of any justice on the court in protecting the rights of the criminally charged.

The jury trial system, as William Kunstler recently told our law community can be made into a protection for the "people" by making the selection process equitable—allowing for more share of the jury to be made up of young, blacks, and even women. (Three states as of 1961 still barred women from sitting on juries.) To abolish this system, just at the time when people are working to make it more responsive, might speed trials but would dispense with justice and would in turn create more criminal trials— at no saving of cost or time and at the loss of individual rights.

Let's leave the jury system alone. Let's not give their power to a former corporation lawyer or politician sitting on the bench. The people need the jury more now than ever.

R.T.

EDITORIAL II

On Law School Apathy....

It was revealed in the report on the Conference on Final Exams (to no one's surprise) that there was disappointment in the ranks of the faculty that more students didn't take part in the proceedings of that Conference. The feeling seemed to be that more student response might motivate the faculty to institute changes in the final exam process, but that the lack of response indicated a satisfaction with the present system. It is apparent that this attitude permeates faculty thinking with regard to most issues that face the Law School.

This attitude is totally unreasonable! It is a self-fulfilling prophecy: The apathy of the students shows there is no reason to change the system, and the system is designed for and fosters student apathy. Apathy=No Change=Apathy, etc. If there is no (or very little) way of changing the system, then why knock (Cont. on p. 12)
yourself out trying.

The Conference on Final Exams is a good example. One faculty member, prior to the meeting, stated that the question "wasn't whether but how" (to have final exams). This faculty member, at least, wasn't interested in having input other than that which he wanted to hear. Why should students be especially fired-up about telling a professor only what he is prepared to believe, and would probably believe whether the student told him or not.

It is doubtful whether any lawyer would seriously contend that all systems have equal access to the decision-making machinery. It would be equally difficult to contend that the Law School decision-making machinery is easily accessible to students. Most of the significant decisions in the Law School are made at faculty meetings. Some are made by individual faculty members. In each of these cases (with a few exceptions there is no institutional machinery for infusing student opinion into any of these processes.

Faculty meetings are a prime example. Students participation is prohibited. The faculty even prohibits a student from being present to report the actions of the faculty in the Res Gestae. This, in itself, is productive of student apathy because it forces the student to act in ignorance. It denies both input and feedback to faculty and students alike.

Data in political science studies has shown that people who feel they have, or in fact have, no (or little) voice in a political system are those who participate the least in whatever minimal access inputs that the system allows them.

It's time that the faculty and students realized that the system that exists in the Law School is one that encourages student apathy. The faculty should not use the fact (alleged or real) of student apathy to explain its own inaction or indecision.

The most often used defense to a charge that student apathy is fostered in the Law School is for an individual professor to answer that he is always willing to talk to students. That argument is not responsive for a number of reasons. First, it completely avoids the primary issue of institutionally encouraged apathy. The fact that some elements in the institutional framework are not functioning to encourage apathy does not alter the overall effect of the institution. Second, though it is true of some members of the faculty, it is not true in a real sense of nearly all. Though most faculty members profess to be, and in many do solicit student inputs, the structure (difficulty in finding the professor in his office, alone, or not busy enough to talk) makes discouragement of apathy difficult. Third, though most of the faculty do profess to want to talk to students, in many cases they don't want to listen or if they do listen, they don't want to do anything for the student (of an institutional nature).
The message is clear. The faculty doesn't want mere students messing around with the running of the Law School. The rhetoric to the contrary is apparently meant to pacify those students who are laboring under the assumption that they have some significant control over their education or their school. As was implied at the Conference on Final Exams, the student isn't intended to exercise meaningful control of his education. The last 'free' act a student makes between B.A. and J.D. is to decide to go to law school. From there, it is evidently the opinion of the faculty that the student should become a passive receptor always open to be 'taught', but never to be allowed to initiate action or make a decision.

M.D.M.

C.J.S.

PETITION FOR CENTRAL JUDIC

Central Student Judiciary is now accepting petitions for membership. There are eight seats open. C.S.J. is the campus-wide student judiciary and has original or appellate jurisdiction over all cases concerning students rights vis-a-vis other university bodies and personnel. There are negotiations presently going on which will eventually transfer disruption cases to another tribunal, but even in future disruption cases C.S.J.'s role will be substantial and influential. C.S.J. is composed of ten students drawn from the entire university community, but law students participation has traditionally been significant. I would therefore urge any interested law student to petition for membership. Petitions and other information are available at the S.G.C. offices on the first floor of the Student Activities Building. The deadline for submitting petitions is Sunday, November 22 at 5 P.M. Interviews are being held on that day and the following Monday, November 22 and 23.

-- Ed Kussy
Chairman, C.S.J.

JOB MEETING TUESDAY

There will be a conference on the pros and cons of various areas of employment on Tuesday, November 24, in Room 150. The participants are five lawyers; Brude D. Birgbauer, of a large firm, Samuel Thomas, of a small firm; Irwin Deutch, a sole practitioner; John Eppel, of the office of general counsel of Ford; and Alan Houseman who is the Director of Michigan Legal Services Assistance Program. The lawyers will make short presentations and then answer questions from students. The conference is sponsored by the young lawyers committee of the Detroit Bar Association in coordination with the Board of Directors.

MOVIE TONIGHT

"WITNESS FOR THE PROSECUTION" starring Charles Laughton, Marlene Dietrich, Tyrone Power, and Elsa Lanchester will be shown Friday night, at 8 P.M. in Room 100. This 1957 Courtroom murder mystery is based on an Agatha Christie stage play and was directed by Billy Wilder. The New York Herald Tribune wrote: "On all counts a fine thriller. Wilder has directed it with a sure eye for sardonic detail. His actors are superb."
Prosecutor of the Week

Gino Gallina, a former district attorney in New York City, compelled a witness to lie by threatening to deport his wife and by holding both of them in civil jail as material witnesses, it was alleged this week. Mr. Michael D. Quinn made the accusation at the murder trial of William A. Maynard in New York this week. "I knew that Maynard was with me and he (Gallina) had me testify that I wasn't with Maynard", Mr. Quinn said. "That statement got me my freedom".

British Judge of the Week
(as reported by the N. Y. Times)

A lawyer told a London High Court justice that injuries suffered in a bulldozer accident affected his client's sex life.

"Is he married?" the judge asked. Kennedy Jones, the lawyer, said his client was not.

"Well, I can't see how it affects his sex life," the judge said.

"Well...times have changed, my lord," Mr. Jones replied.

Agency of the Week

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is expected to issue soon standard lease and grievance procedures for public housing authorities throughout the country. If issued these orders would have to be followed by all housing authorities which now follow no standard procedure on leases and grievances so that a tenant accused of lease violations will be given a due process hearing before decision is made as well as having had a lease which sets out in detail the tenant's rights. A major step ahead for the nation's 2,500,000 residents of public housing and possibly for the dormitory residents of dormitories, constructed with federal aid.

Southwestern Court of the Week
(as reported in the Detroit Free Press)

In Arizona the regents of the University require 12 months of residence as a condition for resident tuition status.

This past May, seven students filed suit questioning that requirement. They asked the Arizona Board of Regents to refund with interest their out-of-state fees for the 1968 fall term, which came to about $500 each.

They contended that they had become Arizona residents by registering to vote in Arizona, buying property there, opening bank accounts, paying taxes, holding jobs, marrying, and acquiring Arizona drivers' licenses.

Judge John Collins of the Arizona Superior Court agreed with them. He declared unconstitutional the one-year residency requirement and stated that out-of-state students could decide to become residents of Arizona on the day they first set foot on campus. What was involved, he declared, was the student's "state of mind".

The University of Arizona has appealed the decision, obtaining a stay of judgment so that the non-resident tuition charge of $445 per semester is still in effect. It is possible however that the university may have to return almost $1 million in non-resident fees to 5000 students if such students challenge their residency classification and are upheld by the courts.
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FOOTBALL POLL

Bob Jaspen, the reigning seer of the law school, has been dethroned this week by Tom Carhart. Tom's fine effort left him tied with your very own Hammer Twins at the 75% mark. As for our point spreads, we were only off by a paltry 374 points. The nearest correct answer to this, by the way, was 45%. What are you boys in Law Land thinking about, anyway? (Also, anyone interested in financing a new bookmaking operation please contact you know who).

This week, in the spirit of the upcoming midterm/final exam period we have decided to give you boys and girls a chance to sharpen your testing abilities. Those professors who are so interested may contact the Dynamic Duo for advice on the make-up of their exams. Anyway, for those of you who are interested in the battle for grades, the scoring will work like this:

The closest five answers to each question will receive points on a 7-5-3-2-1 basis. The entry with the greatest number of points will receive both an A in Football and a free gut buster. So get those pencils poised and begin work.

Season's percentage -- a cool 76%.

---The Hammer Twins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Ohio State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Points Scored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of first downs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yards rushing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yards passing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Passing %.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of interceptions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of fumbles lost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Number of punts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Average gain per offensive play.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total number of yards on kick-off returns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TIE BREAKER</td>
<td>ATTENDANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>