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JOB POLICY

The Law School Student Senate met with University Vice-President (and law professor) Robert Knauss; Placement Director Ann Ransford; and law student Ed Fabre, a member of the Office of Student Services Policy Board; at last Tuesday's meeting to discuss the merits of a University-wide extension of the O.S.S. policy barring job recruitment by "profit corporations operating where discrimination is legally enforced." Also discussed were problems and applications peculiar to the Law School Placement office. Both Knauss and Fabre urged that the Senate adopt a position similar to that adopted by the O.S.S. Placement Office. That policy would deny use of subsidized university facilities (i.e. free office space & secretarial services) to any employer: 1) discriminating on the basis of race, creed, color, sex, or national origin; 2) or who did not have an affirmative action program designed to insure equal employment opportunity; 3) or to any profit corporation operating where discrimination is legally enforced on the basis of race, color, creed or sex (e.g. South Africa). Knauss emphasized that the first two points were currently part of official university policy. He noted further that the third point was merely a geographical extension of currently existing policy. Both Fabre and Knauss noted that the policy did not, nor was it intended to, bar recruitment by employers not meeting the requirements, but that subsidized services from the university would be denied such employers.

Ransford pointed out that the law school has had a long standing policy of forcing firms to see all students who signed up for interviews and that by denying some firms interviewing space the law school would no longer be able to guarantee equal access to interviewing firms for students.

Following a lengthy discussion the Senate unanimously passed a resolution stating that: "It is hereby resolved that it be the policy of the Law School Student Senate that:
1. Be it resolved that,

(continued on page)

ELECTION BULLETIN

The Law School Student Senate (formerly known and loved as the Lawyers Club Board of Directors) will hold its annual election on Wednesday, March 10. Petitions for the positions of President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, one Board of Governor's Representative (a two year term), and seven Members-at-Large, will be available at the Lawyers Club desk at 12:00 Noon on Monday, February 22. These petitions will require 25 signatures and must be returned to the desk by 12:00 Monday, March 1. Procedures and requirements for the candidates will be included with the petition. If you are interested in and/or irritated by what's going on around here, do something about it.
WOMEN

The Michigan Women Law Student Organization invites all women law students to attend a noon meeting at 12:30 Thursday, February 25, in the Lawyers Club Lounge to discuss the upcoming Board of Directors (Student Senate) election.

ELS

On January 28, 29, and 30, the ALI-ABA Joint Committee on Continuing Legal Education sponsored a course in Environmental Law at the Smithsonian Institute. Members of the Environmental Law Society, with the aid of the Lawyers' Club Board of Directors, attended the conference, hoping to gain additional information to improve and expand the operations of the Society and to make the information available to anyone interested.

Although the conference was, at times, bogged down by hopelessly boring recitations by such notables as Louis Jaffe (who expounded the glories of the administrative agencies and took affront at Prof. Sax's bill which Jaffe apparently feels is a critical blow to the agencies) it presented a broad range of topics which demonstrated the intricacies of the pollution problem. Of prime interest to many was Prof. Sax's bill recently passed in Michigan and there was a heavy emphasis on federal environmental legislation and the role of administrative agencies. There was also an excellent presentation of past, present, and future trends in the areas of birth control, sterilization, and abortions.

Probably the most interesting and educational aspect of the conference were the presentations regarding new approaches to solving the problem. Besides Prof. Sax's bill, ideas were put forth as to tax systems for controlling pollution and new constitutional ideas concerning the environment. Equally informative, were presentations, especially by James Moorman of the Center for Law and Social Policy, relating some step-by-step methods for litigating environmental problems.

At this time, the Environmental Law Society is planning a more detailed presentation of the material brought back—the date will be announced later. Also, as soon as we receive copies of all the material (the Institute did not have enough printed) it will be placed in the ELS office for use or perusal by anyone interested.

commentary

'U' JUDICIARY

After months of effort the Ad Hoc Committee on a Permanent University Judiciary had managed to draft a final proposal of thirty-odd pages which now lies before the Regents. Thus, our "University Judiciary" has only one function: to punish transgressors of the quasi-criminal code of the University. Nor does this criminal code, the work-product of the University Council, admit of much expansion. In its proposed form the Rules of the University Community would punish such acts as: use of physical force (Rules Section 2.3), intentional interference with a University function (Rules Section 2.2), theft or property damage (Rules Section 3 2.3), interference with free movement (Rules Section 2.4), and such continued occupation of a University facility as to interfere with a significant University function (Rules Section 2.5). The penalties range from work assignments or fines (Rules Section 3 2.2) to suspension for a set period—("exclusion") (Rules Section 1.6).

The rules apply, with the majesty of the French code provision against sleeping under bridges, to student
and faculty alike.

Acts such as these have, in the past, had the tag of "political action" appended to them, and it is only in this context that such provisions as a jury exclusively of students can be explained. In its application the Judiciary's sole function seems to be to indicate when one has gone too far in the judgment of one's peer group.

At the base of the University Judiciary is the Complaint Referee (Proposed By-Laws of the Board of Regents, Sec. 7.033), who reviews each complaint and can dismiss the complaint or set it for arbitration (if both parties agree) or trial. The trial is controlled by the Presiding Judge (By-Laws, Sec. 7.032(a) and two Associate Judges (By-Laws, Sec. 7.032(b)). The Presiding Judge is required to be a person of "substantial legal training"; the Associate Judges are divided between the student and non-student ("faculty") bodies. An alternate plan would provide for a non-member Associate Judge group which would act in concert on procedural matters. In either case, most procedural matters would be decided by majority vote. Exceptions requiring unanimous votes include exclusion of evidence and exclusion of a party (Sec. 7.032(b)). The only evident justification for such a ponderous means of resolving legal issues may be the justifiable concern about the impartiality of judges created by the antics of the Chicago Hoffman. One might hope, however, that the real explanation is a manifestation of a desire to temper the excesses of the law with a layman's reason. Both systems require a unanimous vote of the Associate Judges for conviction and punishment if both parties agree to judges as finders of fact. In the alternative, a jury composed of six members of the student body or the faculty, for a student or faculty defendant, respectively, would act as finder of fact with the same requirement of unanimity, By-Laws, Sec. 7.032(c).

There is also a twelve-member court of appeals (By-Laws, Sec. 7.033) with authority to hear removal cases from either jurisdictions and appeals from the trial court. The result of the appeal could not be an increase in penalty or imposition of a verdict of guilty. The President of the University may be appealed to for clemency (By-Laws, Sec. 7.034).

The areas of disagreement between the Regents and the students are now limited to the procedure for selection of the judges and functionaries. The Regents prefer their own, rather than a collegiate, decision. The draft includes the provision that both parties could specify some other judiciary, a possibility to which the Regents object. The two major issues are whether the vote need be unanimous and whether the alternate, four-member panel, will be used at all.

At the present time any disruptions would be handled under the Interim Rules, a Regental imposition on the University. Given that the students seem to be rousing from their lethargy and that such arousal will be repressed at some point, if the University Judiciary is justified it is because it places the means of repression in a structure into which the students contribute.

---Joel Newman

"I'm glad you young people have seen fit to protest nonviolently. It shows you're civilized. Now get out."
Professor Cooperrider's recent letter on "Ungraded Evaluations of Student Performance" is a reminder of the need for fundamental revision of the present grading system. The proposed "academic evaluations" are institutionalized and standardized letters of recommendation. They are a welcomed innovation. They should produce more concrete recommendations and spare students the embarrassment of having to violate faculty sanctuaries to beg a good word.

But these evaluations will not correct the essentially destructive impact of the grading system.

The system is destructive because it ranks people. Ranking may be good for the few egos smiled upon with A's. But the pyramid hierarchy of grades insures that many more students are exploited by the system. They are hurt superficially because their competitive position for jobs is weakened. More seriously, grades are a defeating, demoralizing experience for the majority. So is life? Maybe, but it needn't be so.

Grades are sold on 4 arguments. (1) Grades provide an incentive for better learning. (2) The world is a competitive place, and you better get used to it. (3) Grades are "fair." (4) Employers need grades to decide who to hire.

The truth is: (1) Grades are an incentive to learn for very few people. Fear is not inspiring. Fear of bad grades does not encourage adventurous learning. Whatever carrot effect good grades may have does not last long for most students because most rewards - Law Review, Prospectus, clerkships, happiness, salvation - hinge on first year grades, and because typically grades for the first year predict grades for future years. The results of last year's pass-fail experiment do not suggest otherwise. It is not surprising that a poor, peaceful pass-fail course should perish in the cruel, competitive world of grades. The main incentive in grades for the majority of students is a disincentive. For most students grades inspire only a lack of self-confidence and a low opinion of their ability. When good grades come, their value is merely therapeutic, restoring the self-regard which never would have been upset but for the tyranny of grades.

Selling point number (2) says the world is competitive. That's apparently true. But competition may not be the best way to run the world. Some people believe man could survive through generosity and cooperation. The hopeless failure of many a wild-eyed idealist talking of peace and love is perhaps attributable to institutions like this law school, which continue to teach competition as a primary value. Even if the real world is hopeless, there is no reason
why competition can't be banished from the unreal Kingdom of the Law School. Without a competitive grading system cooperative learning would make sense. The majority of students would escape the demoralizing experience of bad grades, and the minority would be spared the ecstasy of ego inflation. A cooperative learning system has to be better for generating ideas since the sharing of ideas would no longer be self-destructive. There is not much danger that this cooperative spirit would last long in the real world. But just in case, its crippling effects could be cured by the inclusion in the bar review courses of a couple of lessons on competition.

(3) The present grading system is not fair. It is basically unfair because it ranks people. Worse, it ranks people who don't want to be ranked. It is unfair because it pretends to rank according to some reasonably ascertainable and consistent standard. But there is no such standard. Each teacher has his own standards or standards. Curves aggravate standards discrepancies. (Grading curves, that is.) The system is unfair because it further separates the successful and privileged from the unprivileged. Maybe the grading system once prevented discriminatory old-school-tie-who-do-you-know hiring, but today it just reinforces it. The kid who went to the right college and who's dad is a successful lawyer is well primed for the grade game and bound to do better than the poorly primed. And although it may be argued that the only secret to success in the game is good hard work, the capacity to work hard at law school courses is not determinative of future success as a lawyer.

(4) The law school cannot (openly) justify its role as a farm team to sort out the players for the Big League law firms. Employers aren't as stupid as some people think. Without grades they would devise other methods for picking their teams. It's unlikely that they will rely on personal interviews or bloodtests — unless they would have done so with grades. Nor will professors' "academic evaluations" be decisive, because as Professor Cooper suggests, they will provide spotty appraisals of the student body. What employers probably would do is look more carefully at a student's written work. Professors, freed from the burden of grades, might find time to read and comment on a short paper or two. And professors could have students evaluate each others papers, a good learning experience for both. Or exams could be given as usual, but instead of being graded, they would be kept on file for employers with the stomach to read them. Professors would love it, and employers who were serious about searching for good students would have to devote considerable time and money to evaluating written work. That might mean they could no longer afford interviewing visits to Michigan, which would get rid of that mad meat market in Room 200. Employers might also resort to standardized tests. Maybe they could be combined with or substituted for the bar exam. Without grades to awe or amuse the employers, the job market for practicing attorneys would be more fluid.

(Cont. on p. 8)
WHAT'S COMING DOWN
IN THE COURTS

1) Hammond v. Brown [N.O. Ohio Jan. 28, 1971] deals with the famous Ohio grand jury report concerning the "disturbances" at Kent State in May, 1970. It will be recalled that that select body found that the students and faculty, and not the National Guard, had been responsible for the rioting and shootings. This action was brought by the accused indicted to have the report expunged and destroyed. In finding for the indicted the court held that the grand jury exceeded its legal function by making seventy findings of fact, including the existence of a "riot" and that the National Guardsmen acted in self-defense. The court noted that the finding of a "riot" constituted a basic element of at least 27 of the 43 charged offenses and this, along with the grand jury's statement that the evidence is "beyond doubt," is clearly an irreparable injury of the accused's right to a fair trial. Moreover, the report impaired the First Amendment freedom of expression rights of 23 unindicted professors upon whom responsibility for the killings was placed. The evidence demonstrated that because of the report these instructors have altered or dropped course materials for fear of classroom controversy.

2) In Moats v. Janco [W. Va. Sup. Ct. App. Jan. 14, 1971] the petitioner, an indigent, was convicted of the misdemeanor drunk driving and was sentenced to 30 days imprisonment, the maximum allowable sentence having been six months. Though defendant was unable to afford counsel the state refused to appoint one for him, in essence contending that Gideon v. Weinwright 372 US 335 (1963) was applicable only to "serious offenses." Indeed a recent Florida case, Argersinger v. Hamlin 236 So2d 442 held that Gideon applies only where the imposable sentence exceeds six months imprisonment. The West Virginia court, however, held that in light of the language of the Sixth Amendment ("in all criminal prosecutions") and the State Constitution (referring to "all trials") the "serious offense" distinction was unwarranted and that the right to counsel should have been made available to this defendant. The court did take pains to note that this decision was not necessarily to be followed where no imprisonment but only a small fine is involved. The dissent relied on the jury trial case Duncan v. Louisiana 391 US 145 (1968) (generally jury trial right available to all cases where possible imprisonment exceeds six months).

3) Parr v. Monterey-Carmel Municipal Court [Cal. Sup. Ct. Jan. 18, 1971] is best viewed as another blow against the empire of the death culture. The little hamlet of Carmel-peaceful, rustic, American-passed an ordinance prohibiting lawn sitting. Accompanying the ordinance was a "Declaration of Urgency" (!) which stated, essentially, that Carmel was being invaded by throngs of undesirable and unsanitary persons "sometimes known as 'hippies'" and that immediate action must be taken to conserve property values. Thus the case involved a statute neutral on its face but passed with manifestly discriminatory motives. The plaintiff sought a writ to prohibit her prosecution under this ordinance and in ruling in her favor the California court said that the law was obviously invalid under the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The class delineated by the ordinance was not limited in any way so as to include only those who might be engaged in illegal conduct and thus the basis of the decision seems to be a lack of rational relation between the discrimination and the end sought to be achieved.

4) An even more significant Equal Protection case, but one reported extensively elsewhere, is Hawkins v. Town of Shaw [5th Circ., Jan. 28, 1971] dealing with the level of municipal services as between black and white neighborhoods.

5) This week's "thief" case is Wilmington Trust Co. v. Phoenix Steel Corp. [Del. Sup. Ct., Jan. 11, 1971]. Phoenix adopted a corporate resolution authorizing Wilmington to honor checks drawn on its payroll account bearing facsimile signatures "without limit...and without further inquiry"; the resolution further stated that the bank "shall be fully protected in acting on such authority." "Thief" then made off with Phoenix' blank checks and facsimile plates, cashed a number of checks, and now (as we are constantly reminded) is in (name any exotic foreign country). Phoenix in fact felt less kindly towards (Cont. on p. 8)
Hark back, if you will, to those wondrous days of yore when students were real men, not spoon-fed babblers. Those were the days of the giants, a time when the professorial patriarch would gather about himself his faithful students, and instruct them in the noblest pursuits of the intellect. Because his students knew their place beneath him, the sage did not need to prepare classes well, but could serve up whatever pap flowed from his resourceful mind. In the elite world of medieval academia, he could: monopolize library texts, schedule classes at his own convenience and then cancel them if other interests conflicted, rarely take a personal interest in his students, not meet administrative deadlines, and in general, not be held accountable for his actions. Thank God and King Nixon that those days are gone forever.

Now students no longer feel like unavoidable obstacles for professors to hurdle in order to reach their true interests. Whereas in years gone by, students could hardly wait to graduate, now they leave with the deepest regrets and fondest memories. All that is the result of being turned on to law, and of being motivated in a positive manner to educate themselves to their highest potential.

Let's dream on.

Two weeks ago, to urge the law school to move further away from the prison of its past, a system of open evaluation for prospective faculty members was discussed here. Two more steps to measure instructional performance need to be suggested. The purpose of both proposals is to open official channels of analysis to ascertain what degree of success the law school's courses are achieving.

1. In all multi-section courses, the various instructors would meet before the term begins, and compose detailed, specific goals which the course would attempt to accomplish. The goals would consist primarily of the legal concepts to be treated in the course, with the methods left to each professor. The list of goals would be distributed to the students. During the term the instructors would meet periodically to write two objective, machine-scored tests, to be administered mid-way and at the end of the course. If one professor's section were to score significantly lower than the others, he would realize that he should revise his approach to the subject.

In courses taught by only one instructor, the individual professor, with advice from his colleagues, would also establish specific goals and two objective exams. After a time he would be able to compare test results between present and past classes.
The above procedure is utilized in many universities, and the results are reviewed by the administration. The system assures that instructors will conscientiously prepare courses, and that the school offers its students class sections of more equal quality. In addition, the faculty benefit from the exchange of ideas.

2. As a supplement to the objective testing, the law school administration would develop a standard evaluation form to be distributed to all students at mid-term and at the end of each course. The form would attempt to measure teaching skills from the students' viewpoint, and would be returned to the teachers for their personal use.

Both of the above proposals can be implemented and refined with a high degree of accuracy and success. Moreover, educational specialists would be readily accessible to aid in the formulation of the measurement devices.

Space does not permit responding to all the old saws, e.g., "It won't work!", "We've tried it before", "Too many administrative problems," etc. Suffice it to say that the attitude that it is a student's own fault if he does not "get" a concept, is encrusted in the law school's educational system. In reality, the fault may lie with a professor's sloppy pedagogy. Unfortunately, such mistakes are often not discovered until a final exam, when it is too late. Thus if a professor can receive negative feedback in time, he can cure the weaknesses in his course. Otherwise, in the absence of criticism, he tends to assume that he is doing a good job, and does not make continued efforts to improve his classroom instruction.

--Neil Mullally

ed. cont.

What little truth there may be in the selling points of the present grading system is far outweighed by its destructive effects. The law school's function is to serve society by providing highly trained lawyers. The grading system interferes with the training of the majority of students and frustrates the purpose of the school.

coming down cont.

the bank than the resolution indicated and brought an action for alleged wrongful negotiation of the checks. The lower court refused bank's motion for summary judgment, agreeing with plaintiff that there was a fact question as to whether bank had acted in accordance with reasonable banking standards. Without divulging the result on appeal, I will say that the language of the resolution was crucial, as was UCC 3-404 stating that an unauthorized signature is wholly inoperative unless the person whose name is signed is precluded from denying it. Should Phoenix prevail? Read the damn case yourself.

Mike Hall


b) It's good to know that the pursuit of knowledge goes on. In re Kidd [Sup. Ct. Ariz., Jan. 19, 1971] involved a charitable trust the purpose of which was "some scientific proof of a soul of the human body which leaves at death."
MADISON, Wis., Feb. 2--The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld today the jailing of Mark Knops, an underground newspaper editor, for refusing to answer questions in a grand jury inquiry into campus violence.

The court said the public's "overriding need to know" what Mr. Knops might be able to disclose outweighed his right to conceal his sources as a journalist.

Mr. Knops, 27 years old, editor of The Madison Kaleidoscope, was jailed for contempt last September after he declined to answer questions put to him by a Walworth County grand jury investigating a bombing that occurred Aug. 24 on the University of Wisconsin campus.

After the bombing, which damaged the Army Mathematics Research Center and killed a young researcher, the underground newspaper carried an article with this headline: "The Bombers Tell Why and What Next--Exclusive to Kaleidoscope." Four persons are still being sought by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in connection with the bombing.

Claim to Confidentiality

Mr. Knops was subpoenaed before the grand jury but refused to answer questions on the ground that as a journalist he had the right to keep his sources confidential.

After Mr. Knops had served part of his sentence, Federal Judge John Reynolds ordered him freed on $1,000 bail.

In affirming the lower court order that imprisoned Mr. Knops, the Supreme Court said: "In a disorderly society such as we are currently experiencing it may well be appropriate to curtail in a very minor way the free flow of information, if such curtailment will serve the purpose of restoring an atmosphere in which all our fundamental freedoms can flourish."

The court, in a unanimous decision, said no distinction should be drawn between members of the underground and the established press.

Caldwell Case

But is said the Knops case was not similar to that of Earl Caldwell, a New York Times reporter whose refusal to testify before a grand jury investigating Black Panther activity in the San Francisco area was upheld by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

"Unlike Caldwell," the court said, "the appellant here does not face an unstructured fishing expedition composed of questions which will meander in and out of his private affairs without apparent purpose of direction."

"Here the appellant's information could lead to the apprehension and conviction of the person or persons who committed a major criminal offense resulting in the death of an innocent person," it said.

The court said, "We think the solution of the crime involved here and prevention of such crimes constitutes a compelling need. The administration of criminal justice itself is a sufficient substantial interest of the state."

WEST POINT C.O.

Cornelius McNeil Cooper Jr. has become the first West Point graduate to receive an honorable discharge from the Army on the grounds of conscientious objection.

The American Civil Liberties Union, which represented Cooper, said that the discharge came through with "spectacular speed."

The discharge became final 4½ months after Cooper, of Foster City, Cal., submitted his application at Ft. Bragg, N.C., the ACLU said.

Cooper, a graduate in the class of 1969, had undergone Ranger and paratroop training but was never in combat. He was a first lieutenant.

He said in his application that he had viewed military service favorably during boyhood but had drifted toward conscientious objection at West Point. The attitude grew when he went on active duty.
WASHINGTON--The environment movement, which has been relatively gentle, is about to escalate to a technique it calls "ecotage"--a contraction of the words "ecology" and "sabotage."

In short, the movement is seeking ways--legal and illegal--to harass and disrupt polluters.

Half whimsically, half seriously, Environmental Action, a Washington-based ecology group, has begun "a national contest for armchair activists interested in tactics which can be used by concerned citizens to stop pollution."

SAM LOVE, a spokesman for environmental action, said any ideas for new tactics would be considered by the contest judges but preference will be given to those "which can be implemented without injuring life systems."

"The entrant who submits the most imaginative and creative idea," Love said, will be awarded the "Golden Fox" trophy.

The trophy was named after an anonymous Chicago suburbanite who calls himself The Fox. Striking mostly at night, The Fox has sent polluters dead fish, stuffed their smokestacks and soiled their executive office carpets with chemicals their plants deposit in area waterways.

Love said environmental action decided to begin the contest because the ecology movement, which has been adopted by many business and governmental groups, has run out of effective tactics.

Boycotts, threats of strikes, stockholder movements and demonstrations no longer work, Love said.

"For many the only option is the bomb," he added. "Environmental action believes there are other ways to effect positive social change."

Love said he expects to include most of the entries in a "tactical handbook" for citizens, who wish to take action locally against polluters.

Deadline for entries is April 20, the first anniversary of Earth Day.

ALBANY, Feb. 2--A student rights group that has been attempting to weld the campuses of the huge State University into a sizable power bloc filed its first lawsuit today, demanding greater due-process protection in student disciplinary procedures.

The suit, which was directed at the university's board of trustees, was brought by the Student Association of the State University, an 18-month-old group that claims affiliation with associations on nearly half of the university's 50 major campuses.

The leaders of the association, which has a former legislative researcher as its $15,000-a-year director, emphasized at a news conference their commitment to "national" challenges of what they see as injustices in the system.

The association, which is a nonprofit corporation rather than a registered legislative lobbying organization, brought the suit in Federal Court in Brooklyn to direct the challenge at one of the state system's four main hubs, the State University Center at Stony Brook, L. I.

Rules Held Arbitrary

Richard A. Lippe, a Mineola, L. I., lawyer who is counsel to the group, said that the suit was not challenging the right of the university's board of trustees to set rules on campus order and student discipline. Instead, he said, it questioned the "arbitrariness" of the present rules, which he contended denied constitutional due process.

The Student Association contended the regulations were unconstitutional because they established campus administrators as "prosecutor and judge" in disciplinary procedures, permitted administrators to suspend students before findings were made, and had no system-wide standards for judging what constituted improper student conduct.
PRIVACY LIMITS

WASHINGTON--The average person probably would consider it a favor if the government offered free surgery to remove a bullet from his arm.

But not James Lee Crowder, 18, who calls the offer an "invasion of privacy." He wants to fight off the favor.

The problem, as seen by Crowder and his lawyer, Robert Bennett, is the government's motive: If the bullet matches certain others they have, Crowder might be indicted for first-degree murder.

He and Sandra Louvonne Toomer have been arrested in connection with the Dec. 18 death of Dr. James E. Bowman, a dentist, who was shot in his basement office here.

Dr. Bowman died of bullet wounds from his own gun, according to police laboratory reports, presumably after a struggle with two people intending to rob him.

IF IT CAN BE proved that the dentist shot and wounded Crowder in the arm and leg, the U.S. attorney's office says, it may also be provable that Crowder shot and killed the dentist.

Assistant U.S. Atty. Gregory C. Brady went before Chief Judge Edward M. Curran of U.S. District Court requesting an order "which is the equivalent of a search warrant" to recover the bullets lodged in Crowder.

While it might be dangerous to attempt retrieval of the bullet in Crowder's leg, Brady said, the one in his arm is "superficially beneath the skin" and removal will be "routine, simple and medically accepted."

DESPITE the assurance of Dr. Marcus P. Goumas, chief medical officer at D.C. jail, that it would not hurt, Bennett protested vehemently.

A lively debate between him and Curran ensued.

"Stop wasting my time," growled the judge as Bennett contended that no American court had ever before permitted such explorations for bullets.

"They're asking you to cut into a man's body," Crowder's lawyer complained. But the judge rejected his plea.

Brady promised the search warrant would be executed "as soon as possible."

JOB POLICY (Continued from page 1)

The Law School Senate, concerned with the practice of discrimination, in employment, based on race, creed, color, sex or national origin, adopts the following policy: No employee, private or governmental, who does not have an affirmative action program, shall be permitted to use the Law School Placement Office's facilities.

2. Be it resolved that, The Law School Senate, concerned with the lack of employment opportunities for minority group members, adopts the following policy: No employee, private or governmental, who does not have an affirmative action program, shall be permitted to use the Law School Placement Office's facilities.

3. Be it resolved that, No profit corporation operated where discrimination is legally enforced on the basis of race, color, creed, or sex, for example, South Africa, shall be allowed to use the services of the Law School Placement Office.

Allegations that a company has discriminated in its recruiting or hiring in any of its business activities either within or without the United States may be made to the committee named in this memo. A determination shall be made if there is sufficient evidence to request the company involved to participate in a public forum. Failure to participate in a public forum will automatically result in the company not being allowed to use Law School Placement Office Services. Determination of violation and the sanction to be a (warning or denial of use of the services of the Law School Placement Office) will be determined within the Law School.
Ransford said that she had been told to inform the Senate that it could not determine the policy of the law school and that any policy decisions must be made by the faculty and the administration.

The Regents at their monthly meeting, Friday, refused to adopt the O.S.S. policy as University-wide policy. They instead adopted a policy stating,

"No placement services shall be made available to any organization or individual that discriminates in recruitment or employment against any person because of race, color, creed, sex, religion, or national origin.

"Neither shall any placement service be made available for the purpose of recruitment for employment in any country where discrimination is legally enforced on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, religion or national origin."

In a public hearing on the question Thursday Dean Francis Allen of the law school spoke in opposition to the adoption of the O.S.S. policy as a university-wide policy, as did the Deans of the School of Business Administration and the Engineering College. Knauss and members of the O.S.S. policy board spoke in favor of the policy. In addition to the Law School Student Senate, the Student Government Council, the Graduate Assembly, and the student governments of the College of Literature Science and the Arts, and the schools of Medicine, Dentistry, Social Work, Business Administration and Public Health supported the extension of the O.S.S. policy to the whole university. The student governments of the engineering college and the school of library science opposed the extension of the policy.

---M.D.M.

BOOKS

Before the library or professors students throw away law books, they should check with The Rev. James Hood of Detroit. He is trying to interest inner city kids in a career in law and needs law books.

CAMPBELL FINALISTS

The four winners of the semi-final round of the Campbell Competition are Jeffrey Keyes, Joe Lonardo, Steve Schnautz and John Luvanee.

SPORTS

The winner of the University Intramural Squash Tournament is the Law School's own Gayer Dominick. Those summer starters get all the breaks.

The sin of many newspapers is that they spend too much time covering stories in which there is really no public issue, producing dreary columns of type on innocuous conventions, speeches that have been delivered countless times before, interviews with persons who have nothing to say. Too much of our news space is still filled with reporting on superficial events or with superficial reporting on important events.