Students In Court Project Funded

by Jean Just

Late in January a check for $28,079 was received by Peter Strauss, Director of the Students-in-Court Task Force. This check represents the funding for the present semester's In-Court Program and is the first installment of the Council on Legal Education and Professional Training's $72,900 designed to carry the program through May 1969.

Search Committee

A Search Committee has been meeting to interview applicants for the position of Director of the Students-in-Court program. Members of the committee include: Professor Addison Bowman of Georgetown, Professor Spencer Boyer of Howard University, Mr. William Davis of the District of Columbia Public Defender's Office, Mr. Thomas Borton of the Washington Bar Association, and Mr. Henry Resto.

It had been hoped that the Director could be hired and ready to begin operations at the start of this semester but the varying schedules at the different schools made it impossible for the Search Committee to meet. There were also delays in soliciting applications for the Directorship before funding of the Program was assured.

Advocates Preventive Detention

Essentially, Senator Tydings has been persuaded. On January 22, he introduced a bill to amend the Bail Reform Act. The Tydings amendment provides for denial of bail and preventive detention after an adversary evidentiary hearing if: (Continued on Page 6)

Supreme Court Asks Snee To Defend Fake Attorney

The Reverend Joseph Snee, S.J., a former member of the Georgetown Legal Interns has been appointed by the U.S. Supreme Court to serve as counsel to brief and argue the case of Daniel Morgan. He is on sabbatical from the Law Center, teaching this year at the University of Texas Law School. In a telephone interview with the Law Weekly, Father Snee said that he was both surprised and honored by his appointment because the Supreme Court rarely appoints counsel in civil cases.

L.L.B. Leavenworth

Daniel Morgan, alias Lawrence Harris, had won numerous acquittals for defendants in criminal cases in the District of Columbia before it was learned that he was not member of the D.C. Bar. Upon further investigation, the District Attorney's Office discovered that Morgan had never even attended law school. He had claimed Harvard Law School as his alma mater but instead had learned his law in prison libraries.

Task Force Studies Students Bookstore

What response does the name "Sam Lerner" evoke from you? In essence, the answer to this question can go a long way toward reconciling the facts that emerged from a comprehensive study which the Law Weekly undertook—namely, the feasibility of including some type of student-run book store in the new Law Center. A task force, headed by Gary D. Rose, a second year student set out to "get the facts," and the purpose of this article is not to draw conclusions, but to set down some of the salient findings and insights which appear noteworthy as a result of that investigation.

Realizable Goal

First, a student-operated book store is a realizable goal. A recent survey conducted by the University President and by the District Attorney's Office ascertained the facts that a book store may be run successfully while giving the students a ten percent discount on books and supplies. Also, Mr. Rose was assured by Dean McMillan that the program will be confined to Small Claims Court until next fall.

Summer Job

For the summer, one second-year student from each of the five law schools will be hired on a full-time basis to work for the Georgetown Legal Interns has the Small Claims Court and on the performance in court begins and regular meeting of the student advocate with the Director during the semester. The program will be confined to Small Claims Court unless next fall.

Four Credits

Next fall the full program will begin. Student advocates will represent indigent clients in both the Small Claims and the Landlord-Tenant branches of General Sessions. The program will be carried four as a four-credit course at each of the Smallest. (Continued on Page 8)
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Senator Joseph D. Tydings

SEN. TYDINGS ENDORSES PLAN TO STRENGTHEN D.C. BAIL ACT

by A. Michael Knapp

Senator Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.), addressed a group of student and alumni brothers of Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity on February 5. The luncheon, sponsored by GULC's Edward Douglass White Senate, was held in the U.S. Capitol building and received national television and newspaper coverage. In addition to many local law school student brothers and rushers, the luncheon was attended by three national Delta Theta officers, many local alumni, and Mr. Adrian Fisher, the Dean-designate of GULC, as a special guest.

Tydings is one of the Senate's foremost experts on the bail reform issue. He has served on the Senate Committee on the Judiciary since his election to the Senate in 1965, and to secure passage of the original Bail Reform Act of 1966. In addition, Senator Tydings is now Chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and as such is directly concerned with the serious crime problem in the Nation's Capital. Recently, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings on the problems of the D.C. courts and the other federal courts, centering attention on the bail reform question. Most of the D.C. judges have appeared before Tydings. Judge Charles W. Hallbeck, of the Court of General Sessions, gave the Judiciary Committee a pitch almost identical to that in his speech to Delta Theta Phi at GULC last spring: that the Bail Reform Act of 1966 must be changed to provide for preventive detention.

Advocates Preventive Detention

Essentially, Senator Tydings has been persuaded. On January 22, he introduced a bill to amend the Bail Reform Act. The Tydings amendment provides for denial of bail and preventive detention after an adversary evidentiary hearing if: (Continued on Page 6)

Selection Committee Work Gains Praise For Students

Although feelings, as to the general concept, were mixed, it appears that the student members of the search committees for both the new University President and Law Center Dean acquitted themselves during the selection process leading to the recent respective appointments of F. Robert H. Henle and Mr. Adrian Fisher. The reactions of faculty committee members, with respect to their student counterparts, indicate that the door may be opened to further activities of a similar nature with increased influence and representation on the part of future student body spokesmen.

Student representation on the Search Committee for the Law Center Dean came only after much lobbying by student leaders and through a surprising, eleventh hour intervention by outgoing University President Gerard J. Campbell, S.J. (see Law Weekly, vol. 3, no. 3). Although the two student appointees, John Wintrol and Don Burris, were outnumbered on the Committee by a total of 7-2 in terms of student-nonstudent voting power, they apparently left a favorable impression on their committee counterparts.

When questioned by the Law Weekly as to his views concerning the performance of Messrs. Wintrol and Burris, Committee Chairman Judge Charles Fahy observed that the student representatives were experienced in court. (Continued on Page 8)

Seeking Court for the aid of the Claims Court for the aid of the

Students-in-Court

(Continued on Page 4)
Lest you fail to realize what is going on about your heads be advised that you are on the threshold of the most significant structural crisis in higher education since the establishment of the public education system. The vacuum currently being created as administrative officials relinquish more and more of their power to determine policy matters of the university will be filled by student and faculty voices. As these voices become more and more powerful they cannot help but face each other in conflict.

This conflict is only natural as the participants are on different ends of the educational spectrum. The natural nature of the conflict, however, belies its potentially destructive nature. The faculty member is generally concerned about the educational nature of the institution while the student is also endangering the faculty member's personal and professional nature. Yet in making these desires as he goes about seeking what, to him, is his personal and professional nature, the student may attack university policy on tenure as giving refuge to "dead wood" on the faculty. But in so doing the student attacks the security principle of each faculty member. The student may attack the grading structure or the course structure or the examination schedule because it does not adequately serve his needs. But in so doing the student also challenges the freedom of the faculty member. The student may attack the budgetary disbursement of the university as being geared to matters other than those of the student. Or he may attack the tuition as unreasonably high or terribly misspent. Yet in making these moves the student is also endangering the faculty member's funding for outside research.

At an earlier time, perhaps only five years ago, students could rail about tuitions, poor courses, "dead wood," and receive the sympathy of a large part of the faculty. And the faculty could become militant about "change" in the university. But in so doing the student attacks the freedom of the faculty member. The student may attack the budgetary disbursement of the university as being geared to matters other than those of the student. Or he may attack the tuition as unreasonably high or terribly misspent. Yet in making these moves the student is also endangering the faculty member's funding for outside research.

(Continued on Page 7)
Three New Professors Hired: 
Black Activist Joins Law Faculty

Jerome Shuman has engaged in a number of faculty and student body with sufficient to: the Administrative Conference of the United States; the Committee on Information, Education and Reports; the United States Office of Education and Education Department of H.E.W. Prof. Shuman, in addition, has delivered a number of speeches and lectures and written several scholarly papers concerned mainly with various areas of commercial and real estate law as well as the social, economic and legal problems of today’s Negroes. Shuman’s views can be found in the Washington Afro-American newspaper.

Julian R. Kossow obtained his J.D. degree from GULC in 1967 graduating 16th in his class. Kossow will be remembered by some students as the 1968 fall semester Law Center instructor in Future Interests. He earned his B.A. degree from the University of Pennsylvania, where he was ranked in the upper 10% of the Class of 1965.

When asked to comment on his appointment, Mr. Kossow remarked, “I am delighted with the appointment. Not only do the opportunity to associate with a faculty and student body that one respects and knows so well . . . It is precisely the type of faculty and student body with which I wish to associate.” When requested to state his position on the role of the professor in a law center . . ., I should focus the examinations, research, publications and publications outside the class room or should the emphasis be on inter-school activities and relationships.

Shuman has also served as Consultant to: the Administrative Conference of the United States; the Committee on Information, Education and Reports; the United States Office of Education and Education Department of H.E.W. Prof. Shuman, in addition, has delivered a number of speeches and lectures and written several scholarly papers concerned mainly with various areas of commercial and real estate law as well as the social, economic and legal problems of today’s Negroes. Shuman’s views can be found in the Washington Afro-American newspaper.

Shuman has also served as Consultant to: the Administrative Conference of the United States; the Committee on Information, Education and Reports; the United States Office of Education and Education Department of H.E.W. Prof. Shuman, in addition, has delivered a number of speeches and lectures and written several scholarly papers concerned mainly with various areas of commercial and real estate law as well as the social, economic and legal problems of today’s Negroes. Shuman’s views can be found in the Washington Afro-American newspaper.

L.A.S. BEGINS

Georgetown’s Legal Aid Society is currently engaged in a drive for new members. The drive has as its purpose two goals: to fill gaps in the current programs left by the current programs, and to expand opportunities in the community for practical or clinical experience. The S.B.A.’s new communication center . . . i.e., should the focus be on accomplishments, research and and criminal), and the Janitor Bar project have offered varied legal experience for several years; these programs now have vacancies and need recruits.

The Legal Aid Society is one of the few organizations open to students which offers work which truly supplements their studies of the law by real experience in the day-to-day operation of the law as it applies to large numbers of people.

The tutorial program was established to help first year students in areas in which they have problems. Don Stern also indicated that professors who taught first year classes consented gladly to the scheduling of practice quizzes during the early part of the semester and that they will also set aside specific hours during which the student will be able to consult with them.

Finally, Don Stern indicated that plans were being formed for a conference concerning the direction that the Law Center is taking. As Professor projected it, classes would be cancelled for the conference with the administration, faculty, and student body participating in a dialogue concerning the Law Center and its future course.

The S.B.A. new communications center.

Cities, Crime Main Themes

As S.B.A. Starts Courses

The Student Bar Association sponsored free seminar of classes. Three classes are currently being offered for all interested persons.

Dean David J. McCarthy and Professors John Murphy and Addison M. Bowman are conducting a course in “Selected Urban Problems. This class meets in Hall 1 each Tuesday at 2:30 p.m. The first session was held on February 11 with Professor Murphy presenting Howard Mostov in a discussion of the crisis in urban housing. Mr. Mostov was formerly the Executive Director of the President’s Committee on Urban Housing.

Exciting Course

Professor Chester A. Antilou is offering one of the potentially most exciting course at the Law Center in his “Development of New Cities.” This class meets on Wednesdays at 5:30 p.m. in Hall 3. The course will discuss various existing examples of model and planned urban communities throughout the world and their possible value in solving American urban problems. In an initial presentation, on February 12, Mr. David Warner outlined proposed design for Columbia Maryland. Columbia is a recent attempt to establish large, self-contained community living through urban planning, a three hundred acre urban center within the midst of urban Washington.

Law and Sociology

The third course offered by the Free University is Mr. Len Zeitz’s “Law and Sociology” in Hall 3 on Thursdays at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Zeitz is the Senior Research Sociologist at the GULC Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure as well as being an adjunct professor of law here. This course will attempt to deal with the problem of crime through the phenomenon of human development.

L.M.A.N.

HUNT

on accomplished prefabricated structures will virtually eliminate much of the carpentry trade and other related occupations; and how this

THE

A large part of the American public will be viewed with an end in mind of determining what a system helps to create the crime problem and where it helps to perpetuate it. This discussion will then turn with particularity to the American penal institutions, the theory of incarceration, and possible workable alternatives to incarceration.
Miranda Effects Under Intense Study

by Larry Berman

When the Supreme Court rendered its controversial Miranda decision in the summer of 1966, the courts, Congress, police and the community reacted strongly. Many claimed that by requiring police to give the necessary "Miranda Warning" to all suspects placed in "custodial interrogation" and by applying the exclusionary rule to all evidence which was obtained as a result of failing to give the prescribed warning amounted to a policy of "coddling" criminals and would result in an increase in the already rising crime rates.

Studies

Many studies on the effects of Miranda were conducted shortly after it was decided. Among the more notable projects includes the study conducted at the Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure at the Law Center which was recently reported in the May, 1968 issue of the Michigan Law Review. These studies found that Miranda did not result in hampering law enforcement.

Internal Effect

In March, 1967, the Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, under the personal supervision of its director, Prof. Samuel Dash, together with the National Association of Social Workers, embarked on a new study of Miranda. This joint sponsorship assured a larger financial support than the Institute could provide alone. The Institute obtained the cooperation of the American Bar Foundation and some of the more reputable social agencies involved in the study and demonstrated the interest of the IACP, under the direction of Mr. Quinn Tamm, in the implementation of the Miranda decision. The project, known as the Nationwide Miranda Survey, differed with the other studies in several important ways. Whereas all the other studies had focused upon the impact which Miranda had on crime and criminal law enforcement, the objectives of the Nationwide Survey was to discover the internal effect of Miranda on police practices and procedures. Specifically, the Institute sought to learn from police agencies whether or not the restraints which the Supreme Court placed upon police as a result of Miranda were followed by any changes in interrogation procedures and by new and improved methods in gathering evidence which did not concentrate upon interrogation.

Shakedown Period

Another important distinction between the Nationwide Survey and the other studies involves the time periods when the data was gathered. The earlier Miranda studies had been criticized on the grounds that they were conducted so quickly after Miranda had been decided, that a sufficient "shakedown period" was not permitted so that the true effects of Miranda could be felt. The data for the Nationwide Survey, however, was not collected until nearly one and one-half years after Miranda was decided. Hence, criticism of the conclusions of the Nationwide Survey on these grounds would only be a further justification for those conclusions.

350 Cities Surveyed

The other Miranda studies were confined to a particular city. The Nationwide Survey, as the title suggests, analyzed police interrogation practices in 350 cities throughout the country. The selection of the sample cities took into consideration many factors. For example, in order to include the major police departments in the country, it was decided to include the 75 largest cities in the country. To compare their practices against those in the small non-urban departments, every city having a population of 25,000-50,000 and located outside a major urbanized area was included in the sample. As a result of this selection, the following comparisons of police interrogation procedures could be made: (1) City vs. small town; (2) the "core" city vs. the suburbs; (3) urban vs. rural and (4) small town urban vs. small town rural.

A further breakdown was made along geographical area. The Country was divided up into nine geographic regions. Future analyses of the data will seek to identify any differences in police interrogation practices which may exist among the various regions.

Future Analysis

Two additional types of material were gathered and will be incorporated into future analyses. The first type of material is socio-economic data on the population of the areas surveyed. The second type of data is economic data on all the states. The microeconomic data will be used to identify any regional differences in Miranda's effect. The socio-economic data will be used to indicate the effect of Miranda on the crime rate in the various regions as they are compared against each other.

Subtle Changes

The questionnaire itself was titled "The Consequences of Miranda: Shaking and Interrogation." Rather than flay ask whether or not the department's procedures fully complied with the requirements set up by Miranda, the questions were phrased in a more subtle way. Police were asked what it was like to be a Miranda policeman. They were asked if certain practices were employed in the interrogation of suspects. The questionnaire was mailed to police departments containing the four basic rights which must be given to a suspect immediately upon being taken into custody, and the implementation of forms for recording rights waived admissions. The questionnaire was designed to produce actual changes in interrogation procedures. In other words, it would show whether Miranda is being practiced as well as it is being preached.

Mid-Atlantic Low

After two waves of questionnaires were mailed out, only 62 per cent or 216 of the 350 departments responded. Curiously, the area with the lowest response rate was the Midwest Atlantic states, with only 14 per cent responding. This region includes New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The reason for the low response rate, was the low response rate, 39 per cent, recorded in the East South Central region, which includes Mississippi, Tennessee and Kentucky.

New England High

The highest response rate was found among the New England (Continued on Page 5)
Student Party Leaders Discuss 1968 Elections

The Law Weekly has invited the presidents of the Young Democrats and Young Republicans for a discussion of the candidates in the election past. Here, then, are the comments of William Jarlumb (70) of the YD's and Skip Kurmay (69) of the YR's.

Young Democrats

by William Jarlumb

In the 1968 Presidential elections it was evident that Hubert Humphrey, the most liberal of the three major candidates did not excite the liberal youth of this country. Such a phenomenon was surprising to many Democratic leaders and political analysts. Perhaps this was less a function of the Vietnam War or the problems of the cities per se than of changes in the political climate of the country that cannot yet be fully understood.

Lost At Sea

Humphrey has been the sentinel of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party for the last two decades. To some, he was considered over the years to have transcended the liberal cause and moved even farther down the radical path. Yet, this fact was meaningless to the young liberals, who for the most part, were not politically conscious during Humphrey's "leftist" heyday. Rather, Humphrey the man became identified with Johnson the president; and in the distant tides of the War, Humphrey the progressive was lost at sea. And he did not try to alter this image. He remained a political idealist, insulating stance as Vice-president which might have redeemed him in the eyes of the youth who turned away.

Politically Pure

The upshot was the movement en masse away from Humphrey, the Party, and the Establishment, to the ideologic representatives of the youthful politically pure. And when these representatives were chosen in Memphis, Angeles, and Chicago, these youthful politically pure were no longer—they were angry, appalled, and alienated.

The real question, though, in why was there no response in August; after the choice was clear, after the only liberal left was Humphrey. Why the Great Cop-out?

Lack Comprehension

It may be that these young people felt they were in the vanguard of a rising spirit within the nation that would solve the ills of the national and international society.

Miranda Survey...

by Skip Kurmay

But they lacked the comprehension to realize that the New Left's politics and Young Republicans for a discussion of the candidates in the election past. Here, then, are the comments of William Jarlumb (70) of the YD's and Skip Kurmay (69) of the YR's.
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Tydings Favors Preventive Detention

(Continued from Page 1)

1) the Defendant is charged with a felony involving a threat to
infect serious bodily harm while on bail. The Defendant is charged with a felony involving a threat to infect serious bodily harm and the Government submitted an affidavit claiming that his prior pattern of behavior indicated that the Defendant will likely become a danger to the community.

Tydings maintains that his proposal would be adopted, change will come, change will actually be.

The way the courts work now, the Defendant has never seen the occasion when a defendant threatened the Government's witnesses. The Judge then sets bail at $100,000—far above the rest of the cases because it is a question whether one of the judges involved would agree, there is a “clear and present danger” that many of those released will cause bodily harm or commit another crime while on bail. The public needs more protection than they are given now from the criminal defendant.
Bookstore Study Reveals Lerner Monopoly Aids Students

Continued

that there is space in the new Law Center that could be made available for such a purpose.

The first step was to ascertain what response the law book publishers would give to such an idea. The results were not encouraging. However, some interesting observations were made by the head of the Law School Department for West Publishing Company, Mr. Noreen, who has the authority to make the decision whether to deal with the proposed book store. Mr. Noreen said that West would not be "extremely reluctant" to deal with a student-run book store at the Law Center. He stated that this is not a policy decision regarding all such operations, and that he would, in fact, welcome such an opportunity in other situations (i.e.: if there were no other way to get the books to the students). At Georgetown, however, West has one of its "best accounts in the country"—beloved Sam. Noreen then related that student book stores, while generally well-run for the first three or four years, tend to decompose into sloppier operations after the first generation of student-operators depart. He said that this occurs, West many times has to stop shipping until back accounts are satisfied and until someone is deemed responsible—usually a school administration official—agrees to stand behind all orders. Thus, students have had to start classes without text or casebooks.

Disadvantages

Mr. Noreen advised serious consideration before making such a decision. He said that, in essence, what was being considered was putting Lerner Law Book Company out of business. He then posed this question: If the students ran such a book store for four or five years, the result of which was that Lerner Law Book Company went out of business, and then the student store collapsed, wouldn't students have lost more than what they had gained in the short run? He said that we had a book store that is open all day, as opposed to a student-run store which would, in all probability, be open only two or three hours per day, except at the beginning of each semester. He said that Lerner's has a stock of books that no student-run store could afford to maintain, which allows Sam to usually have the books when you need them.

10% Saving

What, then, could the students possibly save by running their own store? The law book business is one of surprisingly low margins—20%. This discount is the same no matter what volume the book store does. Shipping costs for law books—which are admittedly extremely high—are figured at near five percent of cost (i.e.: four percent or list). With student management paid at a fair wage, other costs incidental to running an efficient book store, and no rent, the store could probably get the books to the students for around ten percent below list. Lerner's View

Armed with this information, the Task Force confronted Mr. Lerner. His first statement was that, when considering his business, two factors stand out: one, this is a low profit margin business and, two, Mr. Lerner has no subsidies—either direct or indirect. By reference to indirect subsidies Mr. Lerner referred to such factors as free rent (which was assumed in the investigation's calculations), clerical costs are charged to school insurance costs. He said that while printing was not discussed. Lerner referred to such factors as "Yeoman's Service"—services that he performs for G.U.L.C., etc. (professors, law libraries, etc.); three, he stated that on a printing of five hundred volumes he must charge to sell four hundred usually; four, he must tie up capital when he finances a printing and fire. He compared the Schefflin book on a price per page basis with other books: Schefflin, approximately 290 pages, $35.00, hardbound; Kronstein, Miller, Donner, Major Anti-Trust Laws, 450 pages, $15.00, partially subsidized by G.U.L.C. Law Center; Hawkland, Sales, 175 pages, 5.50, paperback, published by American Law Institute on a non-profit basis. Thus, on a price per page basis, Mr. Lerner contends that the Schefflin book is not outrageous by any means (quality of the printing was not discussed).

for Lerner Law Book Company does G.U.L.C. yeoman's service in many ways, from publishing material for professors at reasonable rates (Mr. Lerner contends that professors, yeoman's service to everything that would make it difficult to do the book business. When the Schefflin book was found. You don't have to love the services that he performs for G.U.L.C. are noteworthy.

This Task Force is at least satisfied that this is not what was found. You don't have to love the man to assure yourself that his prices are competitive, and the services that he performs for G.U.L.C. are noteworthy.

Insights

So, for those of you who will be around for the next semester, this book will mean something. This Task Force is at least satisfied that this is not what was found. You don't have to love the man to assure yourself that his prices are competitive, and the services that he performs for G.U.L.C. are noteworthy.

Students' View

To begin with, what is the case for the students? Why is Sam not loved? Why, then, is Sam not loved? Why is the Scrooge that some contend. Mr. Lerner repeatedly invoked the exception of some service, then this article has made its point; id est... Continued

ity and receive the ovations of students. The two would not come to loggerheads because five years ago the students and faculties had no direct power to make their changes for such power was in the administration. The administration bore the full brunt of all the assaults. But in tearing down the administration to achieve their ends, students and faculties failed to view each others ends. In the enthusiasm for destroying the administration, they often failed to realize that the problems would not disappear. Rather it would only bring the complaints into sharper focus, and bring the complainers down upon one another in trying to reach a solution.

Today for example, the students at Howard University Medical School are rebelling. But the rebellion is coatsured not so much in terms of removing an unresponsive administration as it is in terms of attacking faculty matters and school policies reached through direct faculty consultation. Today the administration building is occupied by some 500 students. The rebellion is not against some administrative dictats but rather against actions taken by the faculty; it is not committee meetings of administrative officials which students disrupt at Chicago but faculty meetings.

The point is this: students and faculties will assume powerful positions in the structure of universities. With that assumption will come conflict, unexpected and unaccounted for, which may ever so easily crush the university.
FROM THE BULLPEN...

by Frank Rothschild

As the 2nd week of intramural basketball activity drew to a close, it became evident that several well-balanced teams posed strong threats to the twice-champion Frosh club which has been unbeaten in the last two years. One of these contenders, the Loyas, is manned by spirited freshmen and rolled to an easy 61-43 victory over the Inequities. Superior rebounding power from big Rich Miller and a fine scoring display by Wink Pearson assured the Loyas of their second victory. IHTFP, led by former Princeton star Don Rodenbach, trounced the Sad Seven, living up to their name, by a 48-29 count. The Raiders garnered a victory by forfeit over the E Street Warehouse, thus remaining undefeated.

As the Frosh also claimed a forfeit victory over the Undead, a strong team not to be regarded lightly; the closest game of the week saw the Beruit Airport squeak past Murph's Boys by a 42-41 margin. Jack Long scored well for the losers, but a balanced team turned the tide for the Beruit Airport. Larry Marzetti also played.

The Georgetown Airplane proved that it was a team to be reckoned within the East Division with a convincing 60-46 victory over the Schlepps. Scoring by Dave Kane and George Gray, often coming on devastating fast breaks, allowed the Airplane to dominate the action. Moose Krause put on a rebounding display.

HUSTLER OF THE WEEK: Little George. The League Commissioner, after confering with his advisors, has rearranged the divisions in order to balance the teams. The present standings and final division makeup are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAST</th>
<th>WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown Airplane</td>
<td>2 0 Frosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riders</td>
<td>2 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlepps</td>
<td>1 1 Beruit Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murph's Boys</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undead</td>
<td>0 2 Inequities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Street Warehouse</td>
<td>0 2 Sad Seven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not a helping hand. Tom Palace of the Frosh misses a jumpshot try and he can't see why.

---

File Under Graffiti

This bard is not just a rabid disserter
But a student at the sacred Georgetown Law Center
With grievances felt, but rarely expressed
By students who feel that their stride would be broken.
My message is one that should all here concern: It speaks to our mission here: i.e. "to learn".
Unfortunately, this is not justified by means: Learning is secondary, it seems, with the Deans.
My focus, of course, is on the administration, Totally insensitive to obvious frustration.
Of high-paying students with high time investment And a moratorium of social dissent.

The quality of the law school is rapidly declining In areas so obvious, they need no defining. The Dean trusts pleases poverty and budget troubles; they state that the budget annually doubles.
But do they petition for more allocation? No—they immerse themselves in bureaucratic: One other course will upset the ABA! Or whether swindles be taught by the SRA Or whether cancellations of class be printed with seal, On official school paper, that's authorized and real, they make it all seem like scholastic. What in the Pullman All the good courses on the same day befall. While the library deteriorates under a despoit Management by a Mitty-like neurotic... While Georgetown sports a polo club and radio station.

Good professors, it seems, are fast getting high— Leaving like rats from a soon-to-sink ship, My plea is simple and not too demanding: A little more action, and a lot less glad-handing. Now students unite in vocal vendetta— Until this is done, then things won't get better!