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THE MONSTER THAT ATE THE LAW SCHOOL: Which Students Should Be on the Building Committee?
The Appeal is published periodically at Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington, Indiana. The views expressed in articles and editorials do not necessarily reflect the views of the Administration, Faculty, or Student Body. Opinions expressed are those of the writer, who alone is responsible for content and style. Unsigned editorials reflect the views of the editors. Permission is granted for reproduction of any article or any part of an article appearing in the Appeal, provided credit is given to both The Appeal and the article if the article is bylined.
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The Secretarial Pool

September 20th, 1972
in this one...

editor in chief, occasionally... Garrettson
editors associatively for nothing better to do... Clancy
staff streptococcus... Mahoney, Fisher, Shine, McGrath,
Williams, Mishkin, Szakmary (?) (Sp?)

off the bench...

Last year's first editorial centered around the basic
purpose of the Appeal, and concluded with a plea to the rest of
the school to gain additional staff. It must have worked, as
the editor graduated, and lo and behold, The Appeal is back

This year's first editorial promises even more, assuming
that the bottle of wine the present editor is emptying will hold
out until morning. If this should prove to be an unwarrented as
assumption, The Appeal will immediately disintegrate into the
Demurrer's Club, and further publications will be found on the
library bulletin board, where it is assumed they will be read
with the usual attention that comes from the usual student
trying to avoid attending an afternoon class.

A number of things are worth commenting on at this point
in the year. One is the usual abundance of signs and petitions
that have adorned the walls of the law school. Personally, I
rather like it. It's a definite improvement over reading
about upperclassmen trying to sell their "Wills" books for
three times what they're worth. On the other hand, it seems as
though attendance regulations are reasonably a dead issue save
for the sort of mind that remembers their undergraduate life with
the sort of fondness that bespeaks the mention of Hopalong Cassid.
By the same token, one might notice the sort of megalomania
that chooses to remove whatever is placed in the library board.
It contrasts rather nicely with the sort of thing that usually re-
mains, ie. that certain students now owe their souls (reduced
to monetary definitions) to the library) and will kindly pay up
or be dammed.

A second crucial issue placed before us might be the
question of whether the Bloomington law school is in actuality f
fading into the ivory tower that another bulletin board claims.
I suggest that it might be, and offer the suggestion that we migh-
learn a bit from the other law schools in our state. Our campus
is still more difficult to get onto. It makes little sense that
with "legal" employment becoming more difficult to obtain, that
our students should be so dammed limited in their interests.

Oh, at this point The Appeal wishes to answer a burning
question--The Dean's Search Committee did the normal thing over
the past summer. The student members held jobs. The faculty
members taught. A recommendation was given to the administration
in the spring, and no answer has yet been received from that
recommendation. If nothing else, that fabulous burst of
information might serve to lessen the structural strain on the
walls of our building, since less ink will be required to
compose signs. The next logical question is to ask what the
administration has done concerning that recommendation, but at
least that question won't have to be asked in the law school
since the administration has such little contact with our
building that one assumes the more rational sign makers would
best place their queries in such places as the Union, which
officials would more likely prefer to show themselves.

Query to second year students...... Is there a cause of
action against TV Guide for claiming that Topper will come on
at 12:30 when in fact they know all the time that The Galloping
Gourmet is going to be there instead??? (The reason the
question is addressed to your class is that 1st year students
will likely refuse to answer any question not confronted on
Torts, while 3rd year students demand to be paid before opening
their mouths.)

Rumors that the S.B.A. phone has been tapped by the
Republican Nat'l Committee are highly exaggerated. Ditto the
rumor that Local Administrative Law has been infiltrated by
a Communist Cell group.

Interestingly enough, no reports have been made of anything
being stolen around the law school as of yet. One would like
to believe this so because of a new attitude among students,
but the more rational explanation is that no one has felt the
need to buy a copy of Gilbert's, and thus no one has anything
worth stealing. 1st year students are urged to place notices
of anything being stolen on any and all bulletin boards around
the law school. It will not result in the return of anything,
but it will improve the contents of the boards, and will come
under the heading of "legal writing experience" when it comes
time to fabricate your resummes. Another possibility to solve
the problem might be to tell your S.B.A. representative of each
theft. Either it will cause him to sympathize with you, thus
developing a feeling of unity twixt the two of you, or it will
result in the formation of yet another committee, which with
a little bit of luck you might be allowed to join. This too
is great help in fleshing out one's resume.

Now for the clincher. The Appeal will publish anything
submitted, with the only editing being typographical errors.
Feel free to submit anything of interest or otherwise to
anyone who looks like he might have an affiliation. Anyone so
requesting will be made some sort of editor...
THE COMMITTEE SELECTION HASSLE

BY CURTIS B. STUCKEY
S.B.A. PRESIDENT

The method of selecting students for appointment to the law school committees has not been resolved.

B.A.L.S.A., Women's Caucus, and the Radical Caucus have endorsed the following proposal:

1. One member on each committee is to be selected by B.A.L.S.A.

2. One member on each committee is to be selected by the Women's Caucus.

3. One member on each committee is to be selected by the Radical Caucus.

4. Two members on each committee are to be selected by the S.B.A.

The S.B.A. must accept a major share of the responsibility for the current discontent. Our closed, secretive, arbitrary selection process of the past has not been conducive to the breeding of student support. Nevertheless, I must object to the above proposal for the following reasons.

1. Approximately one-third of the law school student body is not a member of any organization. I am aware of no empirical data showing that "joiners" make better committee members.

2. I do not find it surprising that representatives of B.A.L.S.A., Women's Caucus, and the Radical Caucus, and for that matter, the S.B.A. defined organizations, for purposes of committee selection, as including only the groups represented by themselves. I am, however, skeptical of the validity of such self-serving definition.

3. A small group, representing only a small percentage of a given "class" has the power to unilaterally select persons supposedly representing the entire class. For example, the Radical Caucus, as a new organization of unproven viability, lacks any legitimate authority to speak for the large number of radical students not members of their organization. This can be contrasted with B.A.L.S.A. where all black students are members.

4. The problem of dual membership has been ignored.

continued....
My partial solution to the problem of law school committee selection is as follows:

1. Permit volunteers to sign up for the committees on which they are interested in serving.

2. When there are more volunteers than positions, a student review board would make the ultimate selection. The composition of this review board could be determined at an open meeting...

THE DEMURRER'S CLUB (SO WHAT)

Since the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure have abolished the demurrer per se, the Indiana University School of Law remains the last stronghold of the perverse. The Demurrer's Club is an organization apathetically dedicated to the high purpose of being called to the bar as painlessly as possible. Amid joyous cries of "so what!" alleged students and faculty, inter alia, embark upon heatedly listless discussions of the law, delving into such momentous topics as the Metaphysical Aspects of Intertate Succession, Freudian Symbolism in Marbury v. Madison, Lacues: The Legal Answer to Shingles; Plot and Character Development in the Uniform Commercial Code, and a Linguistic Analysis of Evergreens v. Nunan. Spirits run high at Nick's English Hut on Friday afternoons, and so do the Demurrers. The annual membership drive and rummage sale will be conducted in the Law School lobby the week of September 25th, and the kick-off meeting, featuring orations by Hank "Piazza" Richardson, Buss "Morris" Arnold, and Tom "Thd Teddy Bear" Schornhorst will be held Friday, September 29th, at 3:30 et seq.

The Brooding Omnipresence
INDIANA JUDICIAL CONFERENCE L972

The 1972 Indiana Judicial Conference is scheduled to be held at the Indiana School of Law from Wednesday, September 27th through Saturday, September 30th. The Conference, a gathering of the majority of the judges of various rank from all over the state features an address by Justice William H. Erickson, Justice of the Supreme Court of Colorado, and three days of seminars.

Seminars will include Criminal Pattern Jury Instructions, Background and Drafting Methods; and another Seminar on Evidence, featuring discussion of the Uniform Rules of Evidence, Privileges, Witnesses and Cross Examination, Authentication and Content of Writings, and Hearsay.

Speakers will include Chief Justice Norman Arterburn of the Indiana Supreme Court, Thomas Wright of the Grant County Superior Court, Professor William A. Kerr, Professor William R. Jones, Professor Richard Stevenson, and Professor Thorpe of Indiana Univ.

Social events for the Justices will include a cocktail part at the home of Dean Boshkoff, tours of the university, and a banquet at the Indiana Memorial Union.

*******************************************************************

THE FAMILY LAWYER

The Appeal is pleased to announce that The Family Lawyer, a publication of The American Bar Association will begin to appear in The Appeal occasionally, beginning with this issue.

The Family Lawyer, written by Will Bernard id primarily used to further public understanding o the law by the case-example technique. It is being supplied to The Appeal by the Indiana Bar Association.

The first columns: "Wife in Name Only" and "Private Picketing of Homes" begin on the next page...
**Picketing Private Home**

Henry’s plan to open a tavern in a suburban neighborhood raised the hackles of nearby residents. One afternoon, several men showed up at his house with protest signs and began to picket.

Equally incensed, Henry went to court for an injunction against this “intrusion into my private life.” At the hearing, the picketers insisted they were merely exercising their right of free speech.

But the court sided with Henry and issued an injunction.

“The home is a retreat from outside affairs,” said the judge. “When the right of free speech is weighed against the right to privacy, the balance favors the privacy of the home.”

Courts generally have concurred in placing a high value on the home as a privileged sanctuary from strife.

Nevertheless, residential picketing has sometimes been allowed under special circumstances — such as the fact that the occupant of the house is a public official.

Thus, the picketing of a governor’s house by a civil rights group was upheld in court. The judge said the picketers “had a legitimate right, permitted by the Constitution, to appeal to those in authority for redress.”

And the picketing of a landlord’s home by disgruntled tenants was sustained on the ground that he had no other known headquarters where they could vent their feelings.

Of course, even if picketing itself is considered lawful, it may still be condemned because of the manner in which it is done.

In another case, the home of a hospital executive was subjected to mass picketing by boisterous marchers. Furthermore, they flaunted signs that were plainly libellous. This time, a court held the picketing unlawful.

“Conducted at a considerable distance from the hospital,” said the judge, “in a residential area, it was apparently aimed to cause humiliation and mortification to (the victim) and his family. It represents a form of direct and unmitigated coercion, a foul blow.”

**Dissenting Opinion**

News stories about split decisions by the United States Supreme Court must surely baffle many a reader. What the majority confidently asserts in Paragraph One, dissenters just as confidently deny in Paragraph Two.

What shall the ordinary citizen make of all this? If even the experts cannot agree on what the law is, how can plain folk be expected to know?

Of course, the law is what the majority opinion says it is. A dissenting opinion has no legal force.

In fact, in many countries, dissenting opinions are simply not allowed since a majority decision is reached, dissenters are expected to keep their views to themselves.

But on our Supreme Court, public dissent has a long and respectable history. It has been a regular feature of the Court ever since 1806, when a holdout justice voiced his disagreement with Chief Justice John Marshall.

One great virtue of this right of dissent (“the only thing that makes life tolerable,” said Justice William O. Douglas) is that it may help shape the law of the future. Major changes in the law, including even amendments to the Constitution, have had roots in earlier dissenting opinions from the Court.

Still, dissent, if overdone, can needlessly weaken both public understanding and public acceptance of a Court ruling. At least, say critics, a judge should not dissent merely because of minor disagreement or personal pride.

Statistics do show that relatively few of the dissenting opinions — even those of Oliver Wendell Holmes, the “Great Dissenter” — have ever become the law of the land.

Is it surprising that dissent occurs so often? Not when one considers the crucial role of dissentions the Court must answer. Almost always, there are questions on which even the wisest and fairest of men may differ. The easy ones just never reach the Court at all.

**Wife in Name Only**

During their courtship, Hannah spoke soulfully to Jim about the joys of raising a family. But right after the marriage, she changed her tune. In fact, she refused to have sexual relations with him.

Finally Jim sued for an annulment.

“She is a wife in name only,” he complained in court. “She deliberately misled me with that talk about raising a family. The marriage was based on fraud.”

“Maybe I was less than honest,” Hannah conceded. “But people had to tell the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth before the wedding, there would be mighty few marriage

Nevertheless, the court granted Jim an annulment. The judge: Hannah’s deception involved a minor matter but an essential element of matrimony itself.

It is true that the law will overlook a certain amount of what calls “the deceptive arts” courting. But deception about the intent to have sexual relations, even if discussed, is nonetheless considered by common consent to be implied in the contract marriage.

On the other hand, lying about something less important will ordinarily justify an annulment. For example:

A discontented wife sought a decree on the ground that her spouse had lied about having college education. But the judge decided this was not adequate grounds to annul the marriage.

“Surely every representative leading up to a marriage can be material,” said the judge. “The fact that a brunette turned into a blonde overnight, or that beautiful teeth were discovered to be false, or that a pale pink complexion gave way suddenly to pallor, or that a woman mistated her age, would lead court to annul the marriage fraud. The fraud must relate something vital.”
THE WAGES OF VIRTUE: BETTER SYMBOLS FOR LAW SCHOOL GRADES

JEFFREY O'CONNELL *

Law schools make a bad mistake in carrying over, as so many of them do, the traditional grading symbols of A, B, C, and D. The majority of law students at the University of Illinois . . . and I would venture to guess at most law schools . . . graduate with a "C" average. Few of them were "C" students in college . . . even good colleges, given the competition for entrance into law schools today. The connotation to many people of a "C" (a "hook", as it was comfortably referred to in my undergraduate days in college) is that of bare mediocrity. This too is a carry-over from college and high school days.

But since a "C" average is usually that which is required to graduate from law school, persons with a "C" average . . . the majority of our graduates in most law schools, as I say . . . are being certified by law schools as competent to act as professionals. Why should we damn our increasing elitist student bodies with such a pejorative label as "C student"? As psychiatrist Andrew Watson has pointed out, we law schools have long been much too insensitive to our young: Former Vice Dean Louis Toepfer of the Harvard Law School (now President of Case Western Reserve University) used to comment on the absurdity and cruelty and destructiveness of the Harvard Law School making fellows who had been junior Phi Beta Kappas at places like Williams College think of themselves as mediocre. To a significant extent, more and more law schools . . . as our students get better and better . . . are guilty of the same kind of callous treatment of those who entrust themselves to us. The graduate schools long ago learned the lesson of all this: "C" is an unsatisfactory grade in graduate school.

Grades, after all, are the currency of academia. And if we have increasingly able performers working for us, we ought to pay them a worthy and dignified wage. It may well be we law schools don't want to follow the graduate schools and award everyone higher grades but rather want to retain the number of categories we now have. In that event, we could reduce the pejoration of the "C" by requiring those who look at our students' transcripts to think more about the intended significance of the evaluations represented by the symbols. We should adopt a new set of symbols, which would require the reader to stop, translate, and then think about the evaluations truly indicated by the symbols. In that connection, we should adopt terminology that is keyed to our judgments, as professors in a professional school, of how well our students will do professional work. The following chart could implement this suggestion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With High Professional Distinction</th>
<th>HPD (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With Professional Distinction</td>
<td>PD (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Professional Competence</td>
<td>PC (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Marginal Professional Competence</td>
<td>MPC (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Deficient Professional Competence</td>
<td>TPC (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Professor of Law, University of Illinois.
Frances Utley

I know, and you know, the job-market for law school graduates of the 70's is a tight one indeed. Nothing is to be gained by belaboring the point. The important concern is what you can do to conduct a successful job search in that market.

First of all, you can recognize that you enjoy a definite psychological advantage over graduates of the palmy 60's. Most of the prospective employers with whom you will have contact, graduates of the 30's, the 40's and the 50's, faced a market just as tight as today's, even though the basic reasons for it may have been different. As a consequence, they will recognize and understand your eagerness and aggressive job search so like their own, and so different from the "here I am, Orlando, woo me" attitude of the last few years. It's up to you to maximize that advantage.

In actual numbers, the most jobs for law school graduates will be found in states where population and industry are concentrated. Again, in terms of numbers the three largest areas of employment are with private law offices, government at all levels and private industry. Of these three, private law offices provide more than half the job-market today. Numbers alone, however, do not tell the whole story. Rather it is a question of where the jobs are for you.

A tight job market is a competitive job market. Your aim is to place yourself in the most advantageous position possible in terms of the competition. If your grades are not top-ranking, for example, there are certain opportunities closed to you. If you wish, you can waste time and effort competing in that area. Or if you want to be smart, you can turn your energies to seeking opportunities where other professional qualities you offer will be valued.

Among other practical considerations may be: Will the extensive alumni contacts of your law school placement officer provide you the greatest number of possibilities? Or, conversely, will personal contacts in your home area open the most doors? Again, while there are a lot of jobs for law school graduates in a city such as Chicago, there are also five law schools in the community placing their students in the local market each year. If you must commute a great distance to compete for interviews with those students, you would obviously be at a disadvantage.

Two areas of practice, reports from across the country indicate, offer a substantial untapped market for law school graduates. To a large extent the two areas are interchangeable. They are the law offices in the small county seat towns and the offices of solo-practitioners and firms of two and three lawyers. "The 1971 Lawyers Statistical Report" indicates that there are 118,963 individual practitioners throughout the country. An earlier survey estimated more than 14,000 two and three-lawyer firms.

In hiring law school graduates, the small office faces certain problems and limitations which, to the extent that you recognize and deal with them, can really open doors.

The main problem is that the cost of adding a new graduate to the office must be absorbed by one, two or three lawyers rather than spread on the wider basis possible in larger firms, corporations and government. This bears directly on what the small office can afford to pay you. A look at the problem from the employer's point of view may be helpful.

Ideally an additional lawyer should be brought into the office when the work load reaches a point where it would consume 50% of the lawyer's time. Thus, in a very real
sense lawyers in the office must absorb the cost of the other 50% of the new lawyer's time until such time as enough new work can be brought into the office. In addition, a seasoned practitioner knows that it will be at least two years before you are able to handle all your assignments independent of his supervision. The time he spends in the supervisory function naturally reduces his billable time available for clients. This results in the general determination of salary as one-third the additional fees that would result from your addition as an associate to the office. One third of these additional fees would cover the overhead of your space, secretarial assistance and the like, and the remaining third would cover the senior lawyer's time involved in the training process.

Because these economic facts differ from preconceptions held by many students, they overlook the future economic benefits which they may enjoy from the personalized, practical training which the seasoned practitioner can provide. Such an "internship," while it may not offer immediate economic benefits anticipated, can well prove financially rewarding in the years to come. If in doubt on this score, ask some of the young lawyers who have made this their choice.

One of the biggest handicaps which law students face in effectively seeking a job are misconceptions and misinformation concerning the market which limits their consideration of the various choices available to them. For example:

- **Did you know that the median starting salary offered new associates in down state Illinois in 1971 was $8,000 to $8,900.00?**

- **Did you know that there were only 288 associates in private law offices in Colorado in 1970?**

- **Did you know that most corporations do not hire law school graduates simply because they do not have sufficient staff to provide the necessary training and fear the graduates will be unhappy unless they have had an opportunity for private practice experience?**

- **Did you know that legal positions in many state and local government areas will require residency in the community and affiliation and activity in the appropriate political party?**

- **Did you know that, except for patent and taxation legal work, most specialists are developed by the client who walks in the door? Thus, to specialize in the ecological area, it will probably be necessary to find a situation where the client has this type of legal problem.**

- **Did you know that, except for patent and taxation legal work, most specialists are developed by the client who walks in the door? Thus, to specialize in the ecological area, it will probably be necessary to find a situation where the client has this type of legal problem.**

- **Evidence your interest in a good nine-to-five job. The law is not going to be your jealous mistress.**

- **Evidence concern about salary, fringes and recreational advantages rather than the professional opportunity available.**

- **Is going into practice on your own feasible? Perhaps. It will largely depend on the extent to which you are able to overcome the two major problems.**

- **The second is the financial investment required. The staff of the Economics of Law Practice of the American Bar Association has estimated that office rental, equipment and secretarial assistance will mean a total out-of-pocket expenses of about $12,525.00 for the first year. In addition, there should also be a reserve for business contingencies, as well as a fund from which the attorney may draw during the first six months when the revenue may be erratic or nonexistent. For those who decide to go it alone, a cooperative and understanding employed spouse may well be the major professional asset.**

*Frances Utley is manager of the Lawyer Placement Information Service of the American Bar Association*
TO ALL LAW STUDENTS:

In an effort to increase student participation in its program, the Law Journal Board of Editors has adopted the following plan:

1. From each of the law firms which subscribe to the Law Journal, we will solicit legal problems which have been encountered in dealing with clients.

2. Late in September we will evaluate the number and quality of the problems we have received.

3. If the number and quality of problems warrant further action, we will invite all Juniors and Seniors who are interested in writing for the Law Journal to participate in the writing program outlined below. The invitation will be extended by general advertisement throughout the Law School.

4. Legal problems submitted by the law firms will be distributed to the participants, and each participant will be asked to write a memorandum on the problem. (Hopefully the memoranda will be of such a nature that they can be completed in two or three weeks.)

5. Completed memoranda will be submitted to the Managing Editor, who will edit each memorandum with the student who wrote it. At this time the Managing Editor will instruct the student about the Law Journal editorial process, and evaluate the student's work product.

6. On the basis of the submitted memoranda, the Board of Editors will select students to write notes for publication in the Law Journal. (It is hoped that several of the legal problems submitted by the law firms will be of such a nature that they can form the basis of a note topic; if this proves to be the case, the participants who write memoranda on these problems will be close to having a publishable note if and when they become members of the Law Journal staff.)

7. Completed memoranda will be returned to the law firms.

The plan outlined above is experimental. Its success depends on the response of the law firms to our request for legal problems. However, several of the members of the Board of Editors who worked as clerks this summer found that law firms were overburdened with research projects; therefore, it is anticipated that the plan will be successful. In the
event that it is not successful, however, the Board will make further efforts to increase student participation in the Law Journal program. In this connection, it should be noted that the Board of Editors has not abandoned its policy of working with students who come to us with legal writing which is publishable. Therefore, if any Junior or Senior now or in the future has some legal writing which he feels is publishable, he should contact a member of the Law Journal staff.

The plan outlined above is in response to criticism that the Law Journal provides its program only to those who are fortunate enough to attain a high class standing in their freshman year of study, and that many students with superior legal and writing skills are thereby excluded from the Law Journal. The present Board of Editors feels that much of the criticism is warranted, but that some of it has resulted because of a failure on the part of the Board of Editors to publicize its policy of working with all students who are willing to expend the time and effort necessary to produce a publishable note. The Board of Editors hopes that through this letter and the plan outlined in it more students will participate in the Law Journal program than has been the case in the past. In order that we might allocate our resources to meet the needs of those who are interested in participating in the Law Journal program, we request that those who are interested sign their names below.

THE LAW JOURNAL BOARD OF EDITORS
Eighty of the 142 J.D. recipients in 1972 have accepted positions in Indiana. Twenty-eight are practicing in Indianapolis, 12 in Fort Wayne, and 40 in other locations throughout the state.

Michigan drew the greatest number out of state, eight having settled there. Five have positions in Illinois, and another five have gone to Ohio.

Five others have taken positions in Washington, D.C. Two are located in Washington State, and one each in Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Mexico, New York, and Wisconsin.

Four-year assignments with the JAG Corps will occupy four members of the class.

One is working on an LL.M., one does not intend to practice, one has gone to Germany for a year, and one is taking post-graduate courses in another field.

Five have left to take bar examinations in other states, two of them with reasonable assurance of employment thereafter.

This leaves 17 (12% of the class) unaccounted for, and it is expected that at least half of these will report when the traditional class list is prepared in November.

In view of the present over-supply of legal talent in all parts of the country, the Class of 1972 has done very well indeed.

Salaries reported range from $8,000 to $16,000, depending upon location and size of firm. Most have started in the $10,000 to $12,000 range. Lower salaries from smaller firms are usually compensated for by early partnership.

The number of employers listing one or more positions with the Placement Office has increased steadily during the past three years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>1972</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>285  (as of 9/6/72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of firms scheduling interviews in the Placement Office has stayed constant during the past two years instead of dropping, as might have been expected in view of trends in business and educational placement. It is too early to tell what will happen in 1972-73, but we are off to a good start with 48 firms scheduled to date.

Students who are unfamiliar with the Placement Office and its services are cordially invited to stop and discuss their career objectives. The office operates informally; you are welcome at any time.

Ann Mitchner
Placement Director
THE CAUCUSES

THE RADICAL CAUCUS

The Radical Caucus is a group of Law School students who are seeking to reform the style and structure of legal education at Indiana University. The group sees the class rank and the grading systems, the nature of the curriculum, and the elitism of certain Law School institutions as implicitly and explicitly undemocratic. These phenomena contribute to a definition of professionalism which is incompatible with social responsibility and the goal of social change. The Caucus refuses to accept the proposition that a good lawyer is one who accepts and seeks to perpetuate the status quo, and objects to a system of education which forms these attitudes.

Last year the Caucus proposed alternatives to the grading and class rank systems, and sought to change certain aspects of the first year curriculum. The group's program this year will be formulated by its members.

THE WOMEN'S CAUCUS

The Women's Caucus is composed of women law students and law school staff who are interested in eliminating discrimination against women, both in law school and in the practice of law. Our primary goals are:

1. To increase the number of women in law school through widespread recruitment of women.
2. To begin to eliminate the sexist bias of legal education by obtaining courses on women's legal problems, and by encouraging the inclusion of materials relevant to women in the traditional courses.
3. To support the law school staff in their efforts to improve their working conditions.
4. To investigate instances of sex discrimination by law firms that interview through the placement office in an attempt to guarantee equal employment opportunities to women in securing jobs.

The significant discrepancies between the salaries and positions of men and women lawyers will be reduced only when sufficient pressure is placed upon the practicing legal "fraternity."

The Women's Caucus' first public program of the year will be a presentation by Atty. Jean King of Ann Arbor, Michigan, on sex discrimination in higher education. Atty. King will speak in the Moot Court Room, Tuesday, Sept. 26th, at 3:30 p.m. All are invited.

Regular meetings are usually held on Tuesday evenings at 7:00 p.m. in the faculty lounge. All women in the law school are invited and welcome.
S.B.A. REPORT

The ad hoc student committee for faculty evaluation is preparing a comprehensive questionnaire to be distributed to students at the end of each semester. The S.B.A. has agreed to finance the project, and to furnish manpower for compiling the data and publishing the result.

Members of the ad hoc committee are Peter Burkett, Guy Lo Loffman, Paula Wijite, Andy Mallor, and Phil Skager.

**************************

Art Page, L.S.D. Representative attended a conference in Indianapolis. Others in attendance included the S.B.A. president and L.S.D. representatives from the other law schools in Indiana

**************************

Students with business and/or accounting backgrounds should be interested in the speaker in the Moot Court Room on October 12th, at 3:30 p.m. Lybrand, Ross Bros. and Montgomery are sending an attorney to explore special opportunities available for persons with the above named backgrounds.

**************************

Professor Ivan Bodensteiner, former Director of Ft. Wayne Legal Aid Inc., has indicated his willingness to speak here, assuming that a mutually satisfactory time can be arranged.

**************************

Our thanks to Harry "Big Harold" Conso for his still unsuccessful efforts in encouraging Howard Cosell to speak here.

**************************

Any person interested in serving as Chairman of the S.B.A.'s Committee for better bar relations should inform an S.B.A. officer of his or her wishes. An open meeting will be held in the near future in an effort to revive this almost defunct committee.

Curtis Stuckey
RESUME

NAME: B. EWELL SHEEDER

ADDRESS: Chancellor's Office
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

FORWARDING ADDRESS:

Your Office

Personal Data:
Date of Birth: Mature, but young enough to care.
Height: Proud and erect
Weight: Wiry, lean and hungry
Marital Status: A family man, but ever ready if the opportunity should arise; if you know what I mean...

Military Status: War Hero, but modest about it.

EDUCATION

A distinguished record at many institutions of higher learning need only be summarized by saying that I couldn't have reached my present heights of success without my educational background. Feel free to note my name in many scholarly publications.

Law School Record: Indiana University has abolished the ranking system, without which, my grades would be meaningless to you anyway. Let it suffice to say that my grades round off to a decimal point.

ACADEMIC HONORS AND ACTIVITIES

UNDERGRADUATE: Alpha Kappa Rho Sigma nu Dema, Delta, Omicrom Si Pi Upsilon Gamma, DuDu Da Da, Pa Pa Du Run De Run, Shu Be Du, Who Put The Bop in The Bo Shu Bob De Bop?

Law School: Member of many Secret SBA Committees, the importance of which precludes me from listing them; had the distinction of declining many interesting offers from the Law Journal. Editor; The Appeal

Employment Experience: None Yet, but I'm willing

References: Justices White & Black passed away while still composing cover letters for me, and the letter from the late Pres. Kennedy is still locked in the archives. I think however that the mere listing of their names speaks for itself.

Available For Employment: Yes
September might not seem like the best of times to bring up the subject of awards for academic performance. After all, who at this institution in possession of her or his right mind is thinking ahead as far as say, let alone the day after tomorrow? Nonetheless, since everyone undoubtedly has a copious amount of free time these days, this just might be a good occasion to mention the subject.

Problems in locating many of last years winners have precluded announcement of awards up to now, according to Prof. Leon Wallace, chairman of the committee on awards and prizes. In fact, such is still the case: several are proving pretty difficult to find. Prof. Wallace cites other factors slowing things up, including new, overworked staff in the Recorder's office, and the abolition of class rankings. As a result, the only information available are the names of the individuals in each class with the highest scholastic averages during the 71-72 year. They are:

1st year - Stanley Conrad Pickle
2nd year - Joe C. Emerson
3rd year - Rory O'Bryan

A good bit of confusion exists as to the awards to be made for certain classes this year. For example, how many awards are to be given for performance in the first year Torts, when four sections of that class exist? Further, there are freshman and upperclass courses in Constitutional Law; are awards to be given for one or both? Decisions concerning these and other problems are still a ways off.
By the way: just to show how impossible the whole business is, take a look at last year's overall grade-point averages. C.P.A. for last year's second-year class was 2.300, while the third-year class skyrocketed to 2.505. Hmmm...

Commentaries on specific areas of law are in abundance, but a need has been detected for a more general treatment of all aspects of law. There appear to be two ways to fill this need, either collect the separate works and distill them into a single volume, or find a single source covering all the areas and edit it. The attractiveness of the second alternative in its ease of research and uniformity is offset by the difficulty of finding a source covering so wide an area.

After great expenditure of effort and no small amount of time, I have found such a source - the Marx Brothers. To illustrate their grasp of the legal field I'd like to include some excerpts from the book I'm editing.

Lawyer cleverly interrogating witness:

Woman (on finding Grocho in her closet): "Don't try to hide I know you're in that closet.
Groucho (stepping out the other side): "Did you see me go in the closet?"
Woman: "No"
Groucho: "Am I in the closet now?"
Woman: "No"
Groucho: "Then how do you know I was in the closet. Your honor I rest my case."
Woman: "I didn't know you were a lawyer. You're awfully shy for a lawyer.
Groucho: "You bet I'm shy. I'm a shyster lawyer".

Witness cleverly interrogating lawyer:

Witness (Chico): "Say, now I gotta question for you. Whatsa gotta long nose, a little tail, and big ears."
Attorney (Groucho): "I object, your honor. That's irrelevant."
Witness: "Atsa right."

Explaining a contract to a client:

Groucho: "All right, fine. Now - uh - here are the contracts. You just put his name at the top and-uh-and you sign at the bottom. There's no need of you reading that because these are duplicates."
Chico: "Yes, duplicates. Duplicates, eh?"
Groucho: "I say, they're-they're duplicates."
Chico: "Uh, sure, it's a duplicate. Certainly."
Groucho: "Don't you know what duplicates are?"
Chico: "Sure. Those five kids up in Canada."
Groucho: "Well, I wouldn't know about that. I haven't been in Canada in years. Well, go ahead and read it."
Chico: "What does it say?"
Groucho: "Well, go on and read it."
Chico: "All right-you read it."
Groucho: "All right. I'll read it to you." - "Can you hear?"
Chico: "I haven't heard anything yet." "Did you say anything?"
Groucho: "Well, I haven't said anything worth hearing."
Chico: "Well, that's why I didn't hear anything."
Groucho: "Well, that's why I didn't say anything."
Chico: "Can you read?"
Groucho: I can read but I can't see it. I don't seem...to have it in focus here. If my arms were a little longer, I could read it. You haven't got a baboon in your pocket have you? Here-herere-herere we are/ XUXUXGU've got it now. Pay particular attention to this first clause because it's most important. Says the-uh-the party of the first part shall be known in this contract as the party of the first part. How do you like that? That's pretty neat, eh?"
Chico: "No, that's no good."
Groucho: "What's the matter with it?"
Chico: I don't know. Let's hear it again.
Groucho: "Says the-uh-the party of the first part should be known in this contract as the party of the first part."
Chico: "That sounds a little better this time."
Groucho: "Well, it grows on you. Would you like to hear it once more?"
Chico: "Un-just the first part."
Groucho: "What do you mean? The-the party of the first part?"
Chico: "No, the first part of the party of the first part."
Groucho: "All right. It says the-uh-the first part of the party of the first part, should be known in this contract as the first part of the party of the first, should be known in this contract - look. Why should we quarrel about a thing like this? We'll take it right out, eh?"
(The Contract is being torn)
Chico: "Yeah, it's too long anyhow. Now, what have we got left?"
Groucho: "Well, I've got about a foot and a half. "Now, it says-uh- the party of the second part shall be known in this contract as the party of the second part."
Chico: "Well, I don't know about that."
Groucho: "Now, what's the matter?"
Chico: "I no like the second party either."
Groucho: "Well, you should have come to the first party. We didn't get home til around four in the morning. I was blind for three days."
Chico: "Hey, look! Why can't the first part of the second party be the second part of the first party? Then you've got something."
Groucho: "Well, look-uh- rather than go through all that again, what do you sat?"
Chico: "Fine."
Groucho: "Now-uh-now, I've got something here you're bound to like. You'll be crazy about it."
Chico: "No, I don't like it."
Groucho: "You don't like what?"
Chico: "Whatever it is-I don't like it."
Groucho: "Well, don't let's break up an old friendship over a thing like that. Ready?"
Chico: "Okay, now, the next part, I don't think you're going to like."
Groucho: "Well, you word's good enough for me. Now, then, is my word
good enough for you?"
Chico: "I should say not."
Groucho: "Well, that takes out two more clauses."
Groucho: "Now the party of the eight part --."
Chico: "No."
Groucho: "No?"
Chico: "No. That's no good. No."
Groucho: "The party of the ninth --."
Chico: "No, that's no good too. "Hey, how is it my contract is skinnier
than yours?"
Groucho: "Well, I don't know. You must have been out on a tear last night.
But, anyhow, we're all set now, aren't we?"
Groucho: "Now, just-uh-just you put your name right down there and then
the deal is-uh-legal."
Chico: "I forgot to tell you. I can't write."
Groucho: "Well, that's all right. There's no ink in the pen anyhow.
But, listen, it's a contract, isn't it?"
Chico: "Uh, sure."
Groucho: "You've got a contract?"
Chico: "You bet --."
Groucho: "No matter how small it is."
Chico: "Hey, wait-wait! What does this say here? This thing here?"
Groucho: "Um, that? Oh, that's the usual clause. That's in every contract.
That just says-uh-it says-uh-if any of the parties participating in
this contract is shown not to be in their right mind, the entire
agreement is automatically nullified."
Chico: "Well, I don't know."
Groucho: "It's all right. That's-that's in every contract. That's-
that's what they call a sanity clause."
Chico: "Aha ha. You can't fool me. There is no sanity clause."
Groucho: "Well, you win the white...carnation. Sanity Claus."

While not helpful to the experienced lawyer the book should be
invaluable to laymen and first year students. In fact I think the legal
qualities of the Marx Brothers compare favorably with many third year
students. Please don't shower me with money, publication has been
delayed temporarily.