Chicago 8 Conspirator Speaks To Overflow Crowd
by Allen J. Kruger

On Saturday November 8, Georgetown Law Center was host to a student-led demonstration centered around such topics as the Chicago 8 conspiracy trial, devoted by Rennie Davis and Jerald Leftcourt, followed by workshops lasting the entire day. The workshops centered around such topics as Congress, Federal Agencies, Police, and College and High School repression. Among the leaders of these discussions were: Karl Hess, former speech writer for Barry Goldwater, who seemingly has done an ideological reverse and now become an outspoken leader of the new left; Gary Greenberg, former Civil Rights Attorney who was recently forced to resign by Jerris Leonard, head of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice; and Andrew Kopkind, a well known writer for Ramparts.

Law Students in Vanguard
Meets. Leftcourt and Davis spoke to standing room only crowds, at John Carroll Auditorium, and their speeches attracted not only young members of the Washington community but also newspaper and television reporters. Mr. Leftcourt, who was one of the attorneys cited for contempt at the Chicago 8 conspiracy trial, devoted his comments to the duties of the law schools and their students imploring them to affect the status quo. He stated that the law schools are not doing enough and that the lawyer and the law student should lead the change against the Administration and its repression. He also commented on Julius Hoffman, the Chicago trial judge, picturing him as a government tool merely carrying out specific policies formulated by the Administration in power. Mr. Leftcourt further said that the three branches of American government were not representative of the people and, therefore, contrary to President Nixon's statements, policy "must be made in the streets."

Rennie Davis, one of the defendants in the conspiracy proceedings, followed Mr. Leftcourt and his speech dealt basically with the trial. Continued on Page 4

Law Weekly Poll Outcome Has Mixed Interpretations
by Lucius Rivers

Wringing his hands, Smith points to the bucket. "We're in trouble—it's half empty!" Complacently, Jones replies, "Every time. Remember, you're half full." In interview viewing John Kolojeski and George Taft concerning the Law Weekly's SBA opinion poll, this writer was impressed by the fact that the "clearly supported our position." Shades of gray.

Taking the results on a point by point basis:

Poll question No. 1: Personal political philosophy — Kolojeski: "Clearly a majority of those willing to get involved at the Law Center are liberal or radical. I won last year by about the same margin as this poll indicates exists between liberal-radical and conservative-moderate, and the SBA reflects the views of that majority." Taft: "In this question, where students were grading themselves, one must ask, 'Where does liberal start and moderate stop?' I doubt question 1 really had much influence on 2 and 3."

Poll question No. 2: SBA's general performance to date — T: "More than a third of the respondents felt that the SBA was doing poorly, more in fact than felt it was doing well or excellently. At best, students feel it's doing only a satisfactory job, hardly a clear vote of confidence."

Satisfactory Means Approving K: "True, what we've been doing has shades of liberalism or radicalism, but this poll clearly shows student approval. Satisfactory, for all its connotations, still means 'approval.' The addition of another, milder disapproving category might have been helpful, but it would have taken votes only from the 'poor' category, not the 'satisfactory' or better."

Politics is Immaterial

Number 3: SBA participation in socio-economic policies — K: "Clearly a majority approves of our stand. Are we to confine ourselves to the student lounge and the water fountain? I would like to have seen another category to give students a chance to say if they believe the SBA should engage in discussion of conservative-moderate politics as well. This would have certainly removed many votes from the B (stick to the Law Center) category."

T: "The results here were continued on Page 4

Large War Protest Fills Washington
by Tuck Miller

The largest anti-war protest in the history of the United States engulfed Washington last weekend. The majority of participants in this mass demonstration against American policy in Vietnam appeared to be white, middle-class, and under thirty, although many older people who, as they put it, did not want to be mistaken for part of President Nixon's "silent majority" joined the dissenters. The fears that the March would turn into a general riot never materialized and, despite some violence at the end of the demonstration Saturday, the mobilization leaders were more than satisfied with the peaceful solidarity shown by the marchers. However, people seemed less optimistic about the effect of their protest on the President's Vietnam policy.

March Against Death

The protest began Thursday evening when the first of 45,000 persons began the March Against Death, which started at Arlington Cemetery, snaked past the White House, and proceeded down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol. Each marcher carried the name of a casualty of the Vietnam conflict, and as the protestors passed by 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, they shouted out the name on their placard toward a White House made invisible by an arc light which had been placed on the front lawn. Then, in front of the Capitol the names of the war dead were placed in wooden coffins, which mobilization leaders later unsuccessfully tried to present to the President. There was little evidence of opposition to the March. A business man from Ohio was impressed but pointed out that for him withdrawal was tantamount to surrender. Another gentleman, challenging the use of the names of the war dead, was told by one girl that she was carrying the name of her brother. The March Against Death continued for forty hours and was the most serious and dedicated part of the weekend protest. The attitude of the marchers was quiet, polite, and determined, and many wore tags saying, "Keep the March Peaceful." This peacefulness was reflected in the mutual respect shown by the marchers and the policemen along the route.

Violent Confrontation

On Friday night, as marchers were still peacefully filing past the White House, there was a violent confrontation between the more militant factions of the SDS and the police at Dupont Circle. A scheduled rally had drawn not only the "Mad Dogs," the "Crazies," and the "Weathermen," but many of the more moderate protestors and curious passers-by. After speeches condemning the war and the American system generally, it was announced that the rally would proceed to march up Massachusetts Avenue to the South Vietnamese embassy. The organizers had obtained no permit to march, however, and the police set up a line about eight blocks from the building. They warned the demonstrators to disband and when they did not, tear gas was fired. Massachusetts Avenue was then quickly sealed off as the SDS factions and others fled back to Dupont Circle. The confrontation was not over however, as the police used more tear gas to drive the challenging and the curious away from the troubled area. Interpreted among the wailing police sirens were the chants of the SDS groups, "Fight Continued on Page 5

3 GULC Students Arrested At The OEO
by Kenneth F. Carobus

Several Georgetown law students were arrested recently by D.C. authorities on the charge of illegal entry. The arrests occurred in the late afternoon of Friday, November 7 and embraced a total of thirty-five citizens including, along with the GULC figures, Howard law students and former Reginald Heber Smith Fellows.

The group was detained by the police at the headquarters of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The OEO visit was made they were of obtaining information concerning the Reginald Heber Smith Community Fellowship Program. The R.H.S. Fellowship is a summer school program for law graduates involved in neighborhood legal services with principal focus on Poverty Law. Last year, the program was held at the University of Pennsylvania which, however, declined further participation. Howard University thereupon offered its facilities for the current year but encountered a two month lapse without answer from OEO. It was at this point that the student group of the Howard application.

The students met and talked to Mr. Terry Lenzner, Director of the Legal Services Legal Sources Program whose office had the authority to select the educational institution responsible for the R.H.S. Fellowship. Lenzner informed the group that any decision as to the Howard grant was "out of his hands."

The group was then confronted by the Assistant General Counsel for OEO who informed them that they would have to leave or be arrested for unlawful entry. The delegation protested the announcement on the grounds that they were not interfering with the agency's operations, the building was public and the police were in a conference room that was not otherwise scheduled for use. Despite the groups objections they were subsequently arrested and detained for six hours.

Any official decision regarding prosecution of the charges has been postponed by the authorities until next week; however, if the charges are pressed, GULC Professor, John Murphy, has offered to defend the three Georgetown law students involved.
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Spiro T. Agnew

The latest sortie of Spiro T. Agnew into the national arena will undoubtedly add additional converts to the proposition that the Vice-President should be gagged. To this writer, such a proposition is dangerous and counterproductive. To gag any man, even Spiro, is to assure that in the future men of stature and with productive things to say will also be gagged.

This is the lesson of both the McCarthy era and the tradition that the Vice-President should be seen and not heard. Thus many who view with alarm the continued lifelessness and stagnation of Vice-President should be gagged. To this writer, such a proposition undoubtedly add additional converts to the proposition that the things to say will also be gagged.

is to assure that in the future men of stature and with productive
is dangerous and counterproductive. To gag any man, even Spiro,
who view with alarm the continued disintegration of Hubert
imaginative speech on their part wilt destine their demise. Those
others on this expression. Reaction to the rational thoughts of
of "effete intellectuals" could be organized to write fan-mail to the
A possible alternative reaction is suggested by a crowd control
and anti-violence technique explained to the marshals for the No-
It was suggested that a successful reaction to an "outside agitator" who is throwing bricks at the crowd is to have a sexy female marshal run up to this individual, throw her arms around him, and begin to kiss him in a sensual manner. It has worked in the past, the marshals were told, because an individual loaded with hate does not know how to react to love.

So why not start a national drive to "Love Spiro Agnew"? Buttons could be issued with the latest "Spiroism". A red, white and blue book entitled "The Sayings of Vice-President Agnew" could be printed and memorized. Cadres (excuse the expression) of "effete intellectuals" could be organized to write fan-mail to the Vice-President and attend all of his rallies. Perhaps even a "Thank-You Spiro" day could be arranged. I myself would be willing to lend my body to the cause by serving as a subject for those young ladies wishing to learn how to kiss in a sensual manner.

It will, of course, not be easy to show affection for Spiro T. Agnew. But it is a hell of a lot better alternative than seeing people prefer filth.

NOTICE

Earn transcript credit! Be a BMOC! Win fame and/or notoriety! Hie LAW WEEKLY needs three reporters, one layout designer and one assistant distribution editor. Sign up now for an interview for next semester!

Food for Thought

It is encouraging, however, to note that there has been some recognition of the conditions which exist in the "pit" which is rather euphemistically referred to as the "lounge". Some students have noted that picking up trash in a room that looks like a dump—even when it's clean—is of nominal value. That is certainly food for thought.

I dreamt the other night that CLUC offered the lounge to a num-
Singers eagerly accepted—that is, until they saw the lounge. They then informed the school that they would rather take their chances sleeping on the streets. I was dreaming, wasn't I?

Persistent Rumor

A persistent rumor among students is that a first-year student yawned in the lounge recently and swallowed chips of paint that fell into his mouth from the ceiling. The student, it is said, is presently recovering from lead poisoning in the Medical Center. I am pleased to report that there is no truth to this rumor—yet!

Something should certainly be done to eliminate the odor which greets students they enter the front (and only!) door. Perhaps the odor is a result of the substance used to wash the floor each day. If that smell is the price of cleanliness, it is little wonder that some people prefer filth.

Seating Capacity

Until the new law center is completed, or until the lounge is condemned by the Health Department, an improvement in the seating capacity might be tried. A number of folding chairs would eliminate the necessity of students' sitting on tables—and I understand that these are available from the Red Cross for all disaster areas.

But what's all the fuss about? It's just a place where students go to eat—or is it? Maybe the facilities in the lounge and the facilities in the library have something in common. I agree that it is easier to criticize than produce viable alternatives to the present problems facing the school. However, before student solutions came forth critics, directed at lethargy, must suf-

Letters To The Editor

Dear Sir:

The standard of reporting accuracy maintained by the Law Weekly hit a new low last week. Although the news items were of general top-

problems encountered by college

Traffic Pollution

Miss Giacomuzzi reported that "when plans for the Bridge were

continued on Page 4
The Right To Abortion

Dr. Zigmond Lebensohn was born in Kenosha, Wisconsin, in 1910. Following undergraduate work at Northwestern University, Dr. Lebensohn received his medical degree from the same university in 1934 and has done postgraduate work in Neurology.

Lebensohn is currently Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at Georgetown University School of Medicine, is a council member of the American Psychiatric Association and is Chairman of the Psychiatry Department at Shirley Hospital in Washington. He is also a teaching consultant at the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda and the Walter Reed Hospital, and is a member of the editorial boards of three medical journals.

An analysis of the recently published report of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry

Abortion is a dirty word in polite society. Mere mention of the word can still be counted on to raise the hackles on the necks of moralists, theologians, jurists, medical men and countless self-righteous citizens. Yet the magnitude of the problem is barely appreciated by most people, even by those who are reasonably well informed.

A Million Illegal Abortions Performed Each Year

In spite of all the laws on the criminal statutes imposing severe penalties on those performing illegal abortions, most experts agree that over a million abortions are performed in the United States annually—one for every four live births! Only a small percentage of these abortions are performed legally by licensed physicians in hospital settings. This means that close to a million illegal abortions are performed each year in spite of the more recent tendency to "liberalize" abortion laws. It is from these illegal abortions that the vast majority of serious medical complications arise. As is well known, these complications include serious infection, sterility, and occasionally death. What can never be estimated, however, is the vast amount of profound physical and emotional suffering of those women who are forced to seek an illegal abortion in sordid and unsanitary surroundings.

The shame, humiliation and resentment of these women who are forced into unwanted motherhood; the callousness and the damage to the innocent victim—the child who is brought into the world unwanted and unloved—this is the essence of the problem of abortion. At about the same time larger segments of the medical and legal fraternity began to work on this troublesome topic. Their approach, however, was gingerly and cautiously in favor of some degree of liberalization in the abortion law. In the summer of 1967 the American Medical Association and the American Psychiatric Association issued position statements supporting modifications in the abortion law similar to those suggested by the American Law Institute. The ALI recommends, in essence, that "a licensed physician is justified in terminating pregnancy if he believes there is substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical and mental health of the mother or that the child would be born with grave physical or mental defect, or the pregnancy resulted from rape by force or its equivalent . . . or from incest . . ."

In the full of 1967 an International Conference on Abortion was held in Washington sponsored by the Harvard Divinity School and the Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation. Various organizations, notably the Association for the Study of Abortion and the Society for Human Rights Inc., began to mobilize professional and public sentiment in the direction of a more modern attitude to this age old problem. The media have also played a role. Several years ago the word "abortion" could not be mentioned on national television; yet in 1965 CBS produced a morning hour-long documentary on "Abortion and the Law" which broke the way for a more open discussion of this pressing problem.

Shifting in Public and Professional Opinion

Thus, during the past few years the climate of professional and public opinion in regard to abortion has shifted with astonishing rapidity. We have even observed these same shifts within the tiny microcosms of our own Committee. In the early days of our deliberations much of our attention was focused on exploding the myth of the word "therapeutic" when applied to abortion performed on psychiatric grounds. Most of the members of the Committee who favored some liberalization of existing laws, recollected from the concept of "abortion on demand" and even eyed with suspicion the slightly less charged concept of "abortion on request."

But the more intensively we studied the problem, the more we found from our consultants in sociology and the law, and the more we began to analyze the experience of these states that had "liberalized" their statutes governing abortion, the more we came to recognize that all the liberalization in the world would not help as long as abortion remained within the province of the criminal law. We stated "For those convinced, as we are, that the moral issues present an insoluble dilemma that should be left to individual conscience rather than be the subject of a social policy judgment, the ALI proposal disregards the right of a woman to control her own life."

We were also seriously troubled by the role assigned psychiatrists in determining "substantial risk." We doubted very seriously whether the ALI proposal would do what its proponents suggest, namely, to make abortion readily available to those women who required it for valid reasons. In most states where the ALI proposals were adopted the new laws work a real hardship on the poor who are ignorant of the law and cannot afford an abortion. The ALI approach also forces a type of "public confession" from the woman involved. Instead of protecting the confidential nature of the doctor-patient relationship, the details in each case may conceivably be exposed to scrutiny by the state and thus encourage an increase in criminal abortions where there is no doubt that confidentiality will be maintained. For these reasons and others described in the text of our report we concluded that the ALI recommendations were unsatisfactory.
Abortion
Continued from Page 3
from the psychiatric point of view the religious and moral objections to abortion had to be eliminated. We concluded that those who take the moral stand that abortion constitutes murder will themselves avoid abortion and will be shocked by those who condone it. The report went on to say, “For those who take this moral stand there perhaps can be no absolute rebuttal” but it can be equally stated that such people do not need the law to sup­port their moral principles. Father Robert F. Drinan, S.J., a noted legal scholar, has stated that a decision to have a child without love or need would constitute risk whereas a decision to have a hospital therapeutic abortion was extremely dangerous but that now it was “safer for a woman to have a child on the field in full uniform under the supervision of the coaches.” The player was also wearing a goatee which is a slight hint more of a threat to the coaches’ discipline than being unfortunate, another fact ignored by Mr. Schatz.

I do not take issue with the view points expressed in these articles, only with arguments used in their support. Just the release.

Roger Henning
"Class of ’70"

NOLO CONTENDERE
Role-Morality And Professionalism

William A. Stannemaker was born in Chicago, Illinois in 1934. Follow­ ing undergraduate work at Xavier University, he received an M.A. in Political Philosophy from Loyola University and a J.D. degree from DePaul University. Pro­ fessor Stannemaker came to GULC in 1968 and is an Associate Pro­ fessor of Law and teaches courses in Property, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Law.

by William A. Stannemaker

Discussion of legal education at the Law Center has turned largely on such issues as the content of courses, “student power” in decision-making, LC involvement in socio-political problems. Almost nothing is said about the attitudes a lawyer should cultivate. The omission is serious, for it fosters a misun­ derstanding of standards in our intellectual community and the profession at large. Thus I want to open a neglected question, with the caveat that my remarks are not di­ rected at any individual but have the purpose simply to “tell it like it is,” as a basis for discussing how it ought to be.

Role-morality

Every profession has certain built-in demands. If a man accepts the discipline and applies his talents within the framework of norms they impose, he is a “good” doctor, lawyer, Indian chief or whatever. Thus in pro football a “good” player must keep in shape, learn his play-book, go all out in practice, etc. A “good” doctor must keep abreast of his specialty, cultivate empathy with his patients, submerge his own feelings beneath concern for others’ suffer­ings, and so on. In the theater, besides learning his lines, rehear­ sing endlessly, the “good” actor must put the audience before his own emotional needs: no matter how his moods, “The show must go on.”

Role-morality seeks impartial—i.e., judgment-sus­ pensive standard for the “good” physician. Must the audience feel the framework of norms they impose, “I do not take issue”.

“Good” doctors, lawyers, etc. We have local experts on Vietnam, Judge Haysworth, the Three Sisters Bridge, and even racism in football in Wyoming? Query: Are such experts developing the legal talent of suspending judgment? Any judgments are always possible at any time, correct the greater their certitude. We have local experts on Vietnam, Judge Haysworth, the Three Sisters Bridge, and even racism in football in Wyoming? Query: Are such experts developing the legal talent of suspending judgment? Role-conscience

Of course, one should not be a skeptic forever: a time comes to take a stand. Students are absolutely entitled to look at himself to what he believes right and pursue its realization with vigor. But action must come after thought. Only after he has been a profound thinker, has he done more than that effort, he or she should do so in person at room 126 of the Howard Law School.

Continued on Page 6
Continued from Page 1

It became apparent, however, that a large part of the crowd did not favor their tactics, as one protester who picked up two empty bottles was forced to put them down. Despite the potential for large-scale violence, the restraint shown by most of the demonstrators and the police calmed the situation and by midnight the chances of more violence were minimal.

Festive Mood
The 300,000 people who showed up Saturday for the mass march from the Capitol to the Washington Monument were in an almost festive mood considering that they were protesting a war. There were vendors peddling peace buttons and numerous signs chastising the Nixon Administration. At 10 o'clock the March began and the protestors, led by a handful of notables, walked up Pennsylvania Avenue to 15th Street and then up the Mall to the Monument. Although there were no visible counter-demonstrations, the Mobilization's Marshals kept the strictest discipline, refusing to allow anyone to join the protest in mid-stream.

By the time the masses reached the Monument, they were more in the mood for sleeping and singing than in listening to the various speakers. Pete Seeger, Peter, Paul and Mary, and the cast from Hair struck a more responsive note with those who claimed to have heard too many speeches already about Vietnam.

Justice Department Protest
At this point many began their trek home, but about 5,000 radicals marched on the Department of Justice, principally to protest the trial of the Chicago 8. They burned an American flag and a Viet Cong flag was in evidence before police again used tear gas. As was the case Friday night physical confrontation was kept to a minimum and the crowd soon dispersed, although the smell of the "C" tear gas permeated the entire area.

Internal Success
The Demonstration, then, was massive and generally peaceful and certainly an internal success. It may have even changed some people's minds about some of the demonstrators. But with "business as usual" at the White House, it remained to be seen whether it changed anyone's position on the War.
some members of our community are more eager to change things than to study and ask why they have never bothered to question, to jump to conclusions—in a phrase, to avoid “being confused by the facts.” Were appropriate, I would append a list of specifics; but every regular reader can compose his own litany. Query: what kind of lawyer will be the man who is interested in “both sides”—if only to encourage rebuttals, and actively order to rebut. It hardly need be mentioned that the adversary system, which permeates the work of a lawyer, presupposes that truth of agreement or rightful judgment will emerge from a fair hearing of opposing viewpoints. The lawyer must be interested in “both sides”—if only to study what they are changing, to resist rumored inequities than to investigate the truth of the story they swallow, to assume selfish motives because they have never bothered to question, to jump to conclusions—in a phrase, to avoid “being confused by the facts.” Were appropriate, I would append a list of specifics; but every regular reader can compose his own litany. Query: what kind of lawyer will be the man who is interested in “both sides”—if only to encourage rebuttals, and actively order to rebut. It hardly need be mentioned that

**Suggestions**

I think most people here recognize the dangers in such attitudes. Student organizations are following a way in combating them by following the norms of role-morality in the field of persuasion. Specifically, the Barristers’ Council will appeal to those who disregard these norms and thereby put pressure on the student to keep his mind closed to other viewpoints during his training.

**Additional Credit**

The problem with giving additional credit to the research course manifests itself in several ways. First, any additional credit to the research course would be based on the position of receiving more credits per semester than permitted by the ABA standards for part-time students.

Secondly, it was the intention of the faculty in creating this program that it should supplement the substantive materials of the other courses for which credit is given. This has not manifested itself during the first round of arguments as during that round the program is entirely devoted to advocacy, research and brief writing problems. It is, however, the intention of the program that on the subsequent rounds a substantial amount of time should be spent on the substantive law and procedural questions presented by each case in controversy. This will become more effective as your background in the substantive law and procedural courses progresses to a more workable level. It is therefore the faculty’s intention and belief that a substantial amount of work done in preparation for the legal research classes in fact directly contributes to the credit received in other courses.

The Barristers’ Council would like to take this opportunity to answer the questions of your class concerning the legal research-argument program. The most prevalent question presented by the critique submitted to us concerns the fairness of the workload as compared to the course credit given. Before considering the number of credits which should be given, I would like to delineate the bounds of workload now prescribed for the program:

1. There should not be any outside assignments, other than the three briefs and arguments, from the time that the arguments commence.

2. After the first round, the following problems should be assigned at least five weeks prior to the date of arguments.

3. The problems for the first and second rounds are to be graded by the faculty of the ABA standards for part-time students.

In relation to point three, I would like to explain that the problems for the first round, as with the second and third rounds, were created by the members of the faculty who instruct the first year courses. Due to the lateness of the submission of various members, we were unable to collect enough of the easier questions desired for the first round and therefore were forced to use questions created for the following rounds.

**HALFTIME**

**Bowl Choices**

by Willie Schatz

Breaking all tradition and precedent, Ohio State has accepted an invitation to bowl in the same bowl as Notre Dame and the Ivy League is to wrest an invitation to a bowl (officially called “post-season classes”, but known to any college football fan simply as a “bowl”) to the selection committee. A bowl bid is really what the season is all about. It gives the team a reward for having a great season. It gives the fans something else to think about besides the polls and rankings.

**Goal for Every Team**

As every college football fan knows, the ultimate ideal for any team (with the exception of Notre Dame and the Ivy League) is to wrest an invitation to a bowl (officially called “post-season classes”) to the selection committee. A bowl bid is really what the season is all about. It gives the team a reward for having a great season. It gives the fans something else to think about besides the polls and rankings.

**An Open Letter To The Class Of 72’**

Harry Tischler

Vice Chairman of the Barristers’ Council

The Barristers’ Council would like to take this opportunity to answer the questions of your class concerning the legal research-argument program. The most prevalent question presented by the critique submitted to us concerns the fairness of the workload as compared to the course credit given. Before considering the number of credits which should be given, I would like to delineate the bounds of workload now prescribed for the program:

1. There should not be any outside assignments, other than the three briefs and arguments, from the time that the arguments commence.

2. After the first round, the following problems should be assigned at least five weeks prior to the date of arguments.

3. The problems for the first and second rounds are to be graded by the faculty of the ABA standards for part-time students.

In relation to point three, I would like to explain that the problems for the first round, as with the second and third rounds, were created by the members of the faculty who instruct the first year courses. Due to the lateness of the submission of various members, we were unable to collect enough of the easier questions desired for the first round and therefore were forced to use questions created for the following rounds.

**Additional Credit**

The problem with giving additional credit to the research course manifests itself in several ways. First, any additional credit to the research course would be based on the position of receiving more credits per semester than permitted by the ABA standards for part-time students.

Secondly, it was the intention of the faculty in creating this program that it should supplement the substantive materials of the other courses for which credit is given. This has not manifested itself during the first round of arguments as during that round the program is entirely devoted to advocacy, research and brief writing problems. It is, however, the intention of the program that on the subsequent rounds a substantial amount of time should be spent on the substantive law and procedural questions presented by each case in controversy. This will become more effective as your background in the substantive law and procedural courses progresses to a more workable level. It is therefore the faculty’s intention and belief that a substantial amount of work done in preparation for the legal research classes in fact directly contributes to the credit received in other courses.

The Barristers’ Council would like to take this opportunity to answer the questions of your class concerning the legal research-argument program. The most prevalent question presented by the critique submitted to us concerns the fairness of the workload as compared to the course credit given. Before considering the number of credits which should be given, I would like to delineate the bounds of workload now prescribed for the program:

1. There should not be any outside assignments, other than the three briefs and arguments, from the time that the arguments commence.

2. After the first round, the following problems should be assigned at least five weeks prior to the date of arguments.

3. The problems for the first and second rounds are to be graded by the faculty of the ABA standards for part-time students.

In relation to point three, I would like to explain that the problems for the first round, as with the second and third rounds, were created by the members of the faculty who instruct the first year courses. Due to the lateness of the submission of various members, we were unable to collect enough of the easier questions desired for the first round and therefore were forced to use questions created for the following rounds.

**HALFTIME**

**Bowl Choices**

by Willie Schatz

Breaking all tradition and precedent, Ohio State has accepted an invitation to bowl in the same bowl as Notre Dame and the Ivy League is to wrest an invitation to a bowl (officially called “post-season classes”, but known to any college football fan simply as a “bowl”) to the selection committee. A bowl bid is really what the season is all about. It gives the team a reward for having a great season. It gives the fans something else to think about besides the polls and rankings.