CONSULTING THE ELECTORATE
Letters

Dear Editors:

In the hope that you have never read the words to the Equal Right Amendment I include them for your consideration:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex.

The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.

The recent Gavel article entitled, "Bella was Building Bridges for Teddy" which referred to the Equal Rights Amendment as a "fascist amendment" smacked of irresponsible sloganism. Perhaps a quick look at Black's Law Dictionary will clear up the problem:

Fascist. A totalitarian; a believer in the corporate state; one opposed to the exercise of democratic methods or of civil liberties: high handed.

I fail to see the connection between fascism and the Equal Rights Amendment and I suspect that other readers feel the same. Historically, whenever the prospect of equal rights has been extended to a new group of people there has always been opposition. Curiously, those who are most vocal in opposing equal rights for women are often those most threatened by the prospect.

I'm proud to be for the Equal Rights Amendment and I am secure in the knowledge that the equality it is meant to establish and safeguard is an important step forward for a society made up of women and men.

Judith Zimmer  
Student

I'm familiar with the proposed amendment and being critical of it does not automatically render me or any other critic insecure (i.e., "threatened") or sexist.

More precisely, Fascism is state control without state ownership. The proposed amendment allows for the further expansion of governmental power. Women should be skeptical of all acts that concentrate the power of government. Concentration of power implies paternalistic hierarchies, where women have always found themselves at the lower end of the status scale.

J.V.S.

Fonda Wants Anderson

By Charles W. Fonda


There are three articles that explain this reversal of the habits of a lifetime:

1) The candidate himself. Congressman Anderson’s positions (as laid out in his 317-page platform) are more appealing to many Democrats, including myself, than those of the nominee of the Democratic Party. His 19 years in Congress give Anderson an understanding of how Congress works, something Jimmy Carter does not yet have, and something Ronald Reagan probably never will have.

Yet perhaps the most attractive aspect of his candidacy is often overlooked — his willingness to think things through and take unpopular stands, when necessary. This is contrasted with Reagan’s knee-jerk conservatism, and the fly-with-the-political-winds approach of Carter. An example of this is the current rush to embrace a massive increase in defense spending, so that we can “catch up” with the Soviet Union. Reagan takes this approach because it is right-wing dogma. Carter because it is the political thing to do. Anderson wonders why such an increase is necessary and if better use couldn’t be made of current resources.

2) Carter’s primary campaign. In the primaries, Carter revealed himself as a Democratic Nixon. There was almost nothing he wouldn’t do to gain renomination and reelection. He worked the patronage systems for delegate votes. He used the Iranian situation, shamelessly making it a major problem that kept him in the White House when he didn’t want to debate Senator Kennedy, making it a minor issue when he felt he had to campaign. Even more alarming is the conclusion that must be drawn from the reports on the Iranian rescue mission, including the recent Pentagon report. The determining factor in approving the raid was not its chance of success (admittedly marginal), but its effect on Jimmy Carter’s sagging rating in the polls.

3) The politics of exclusion. Jimmy Carter has a very poor economic record. Traditional elements of the Democratic Coalition have not fared well during Carter’s administration. Yet by raising the horrible specter of a Reagan presidency, Carter plans on getting the reluctant support of these groups.

The Anderson Effect

This plan would succeed were it not for the candidacy of John Anderson. For John Anderson keeps Jimmy Carter honest. John Anderson forces Jimmy Carter to defend his meager record, something he wouldn’t have to do in a two-man race. No wonder the Carter forces seek to keep Anderson out of the debates. It explains why the Carter-controlled Democratic National Committee endeavors to keep Anderson off state ballots, despite polls showing Democratic congressional candidates running better with Anderson on the ballot.

Now, more than ever, the American public is faced with a choice between the “lesser of two evils.” It is a choice Jimmy Carter has worked to create, and it is an awful choice. John Anderson stands as an answer to such a choice. Yet the popular conception is that a vote for Anderson is a vote that is thrown away.

This is simply not right. A vote for Anderson is a message to the Democrats and Republicans that such a choice can no longer be tolerated. A vote for Anderson is a vote for traditional Democratic and liberal Republican policies. A vote for Anderson is a vote against the politics of exclusion. A vote for Anderson is a vote for a positive change.

It may not be easy to vote for him. But if enough of us have the strength to stick to our convictions, we may find our vote has done something positive for a change.

Charles Fonda, a third-year law student at Cleveland State University, spent the summer as a legal intern at the Defense Logistics Agency.
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By M. Varga-Sinka

Only man can transmit an idea to another in the form of a truth or in the shape of a lie. The latter is the most likely of human sins. It is more often than not an act of cowardice that breeds its own quiet sorrows. Those who value the meaning of words will treasure truth for truth is essential to the maintenance of a civilization. The man who intentionally violates a language will almost certainly inflict an equivalent violence on human beings if he acquires power. Politics is an art, not a science. Like art, it can be used to ennoble the human spirit or to confound, weaken and destroy it. A goya print can depict the savagery of war and the artist's humanity each inextricably bound to the other by virtue of the print's existence. The confidence of a voter can be similarly bound to the truths or lies of a politician. The more naive the voter, the more complete his trust. The more experienced the political snake oil salesman, the more disingenuous the bombast.

(One of my favorites is the true story about a southern senator who gave his audience, out in the boonies, the shocking truth about his opponent... just last month he was caught in New York obfuscating!...)

One of the most publicly inarticulate, ungrammatical and intellectually disordered Presidents was a modernday Republican” (i.e., “another Liberal”) by name of Dwight David Eisenhower... often remembered as the Prince of Political Pragmatism. His army career was largely built on an inarticulate and a ghost writer of speeches. He was regarded as an excellent editor. During one “crisis,” his press secretary James Hagerty advised him to take a “no comment” position on the whole issue. Eisenhower replied, “Don’t worry, Jim... If that question comes up, I’ll just confuse them.”

Eisenhower, like his vice president (Nixon described his position in the political spectrum as “dead center”), is often termed a “conservative” or a “moderate” or “middle-of-the-road Republican.” The proper word is, of course, “Liberal” — your friendly local foaming-at-the-mouth radical or neurotic professor who hotly argue such a “profanation” of our language but Ludwig von Mises, the economist, puts it bluntly. “The middle of the road leads to socialism.” Both of these “modern Republicans” have aptly demonstrated the truth of that statement.

With the help of his political advocacy and connections, D.D.E. became a full general in less than two years from the time he had been a Lt. Col. Ten months later, never having been in combat command of even a battalion, having never seen battle, he was made Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces. He was so poor in strategy, tactics and the necessary qualifications for military command, George C. Marshall (about whom the less said the better) cabled him in disgust that he was too weak for the position he held.

During the war, D.D.E. sparked the Morgenthau Plan which was nothing less than the conscious destruction of the German economy. This “final solution” was also submitted against Japan but a man of principle and strength of character, Gen. MacArthur, thwarted the idea at its inception. In a letter, he stated (to the effect that when the victor has vanquished his enemy, it is time to stretch out the hand of Christian brotherhood towards a former foe...)

As for D.D.E., he is also responsible for the implementation of the “Deane Agreement” signed at Yalta by three of our century’s greatest villains. This agreement, better known as Operation Keelhaul, provides for the destruction of the German economy and civilians under Allied control after the war’s end — 6 million human beings were sent to their deaths in the Soviet concentration camps, many of which still exist. It has been estimated that the agreement has yet to make a movie. Force was essential and D.D.E. used it. Operation Keelhaul continued into 1945. In 1960, tear gas was used against some 100 soldiers who had the audacity to resist leaving their barracks in New Jersey and who, like the millions before them, were eventually given their marching orders.

Eisenhower’s first flirtation with the Presidency was in 1948. Among those who tried to make him the Democrat candidate in 1948 were Adlai Stevenson, T.D.D., who was Eisenhower’s vice-president, and the Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA’s choice was between D.D.E. and William O. Douglas, (about whom the less said the better) — and that among his busboys he used to compare Roosevelt as well as the usual assortment of crooks and opportunists found in every political campaign.

As candidate and as President, one can find vicious behavior “conservative” generalities in his speeches. Brinley Holt, the old Republican, had written that the actual intent of his programs was to reduce states into administrative tools of the federal government. In his administration, the efforts to emasculate the legislative branches led to the judiciary to political purposes and concentrate more power in the executive continued. He made the first strong push for Federal Aid to education when his own congressmen from his home state (that could not) afford to make more money available to its schools or that is economically unable to support an adequate school system.” He established H.E.W. and attempted to scuttle the Taft-Hartley Act. He did not consult members of his cabinet, members of Congress or the Republican National Committee before deciding to attack Sen. McCarthy. It was with Nixon’s connivance that the “McCarthy process” began. He appointed Earl Warren, who had no prior legal experience, as SCI Chief Justice to fulfill the promise of a political deal struck at the 1952 convention. On the other hand, Eisenhower, this Titan of Liberalism described D.D.E. as “the chewing gum of history.” Earl ought to be remembered as one of the mouths that chewed it.

His foreign policies have been inarticulate. This is especially true of his capacity for policy. His “peace corps” created out of a $5 billion surplus in 1960 was intended to be the Republican teammate of the American for Democratic Action — it had some who were members of both groups and who did not think of themselves as “pragmatic centrist.”

Richard Milhouse Nixon’s record as a so-called “conservative” could easily double the length of this charming little fact-filled essay. I shall spare the reader all but the following: that in 1950 R.M. was one of the original founders of the Republican Action — which was intended to be the Republican teammate of the Americans for Democratic Action — it had some who were members of both groups and who did not think of themselves as “pragmatic centrist.”

The Nixon-via-a-vis Alger Hiss is most accurately described by Martin Dies who was for many years the chairman of the House Committee on Liberal Activities and who, in case of Alger Hiss, there are many facts which have never been known by the public. Our people believe, for instance, that the discovery of Hiss was largely the work of Richard Nixon. That Nixon, the one of his more objective references, “could not avoid saying it.” It is really to its...
A number of students at Cleveland-Marshall are not citizens of the Sovereign State of Ohio and among those representatives of the State's citizenry who are pursuing their studies here, many are neither Cleveland residents nor graduates of the Cleveland State University. I suspect these wandering scholars were drawn, pilgrim-like, to our fair college either by the many alluring features of the great lakefront city, or by lack of funds for attendance at Harvard. Be that as it may, it is for the benefit of both the above-described categories of culturally-deprived individuals that the writer proposes to delineate some of the finer aspects of life in Cleveland. Now, everyone is conversant with the fact that the Cleveland Symphony is considered as being among the finest in the world. Most everyone knows that the Cleveland Museum of Art and the Western Reserve Historical Society boast splendid collections of artifacts depicting man's highest achievements. The writer would embark upon an extensive outline of the whereabouts, viewing-hours and highlights of these wondrous establishments were it not that such would detract from the attention available for devotion to the cultural question of utmost importance in the mind of the newcomer to Cleveland, namely, what are the locations of the best/cheapest bars? Your humble servant must preface his remarks with the observation that insights derived from years of undergraduate study upon this crucial topic while he was a resident of Fenn Tower Dorm would cheerfully have been shared but for the lamentable fact that most of the fine campus saloons which once, like beaming oases, surrounded C.S.U., have been razed. One such instance is the "Downunder," a splendidly shabby century-old, stone-walled warehouse basement which became the torn-Downunder when it gave way to campus "improvement" in the form of a parking lot. As a naive freshman, the writer would listen to "Suite: Judy Blue Eyes," "Whole Lotta Love" and other then-current rhapsodies on the excellent juke-box in that dark cavern, and he learned the exhilaration of entering a saloon in broad daylight not to emerge until the wee hours of the following morning. Who can forget, (among those few who remember), the "Barracks," a dim, dingy, black-lighted shack at 19th and Chester in which the "Woodstock Generation" once gathered to discuss the Hated War, the Hated Nixon and other sources of displeasure to the Love and Peace Generation. The writer frequented the "Barracks" because his did not hate 50c per-glass beer on "Nickel Night." A dollar's ration guaranteed a convivial night in those pre-inflationary times. Sadly, the "Barracks" was honorarily discharged shortly after the War ended, and its site is commemorated by, what else, a parking lot.

The campus rathskeller "Fat Glenn's" is located in the former underground garage of the Mather Mansion, (University Hall), and remains a fine place for aficionados of live rock-and-roll. The 3.2 beer, generously spiked with water, is reasonably priced, the price of admission is moderate, and for a small sum one may become pleasantly befuddled and have a rather good time of it. "Fat Glenn's" is on a rather slim schedule of late, however, as a result of some difficulties involving high-schoolers sporting false I.D. cards, and one must watch the C.S.U. "Cauldron" for notices regarding the hours of this beer-hall.

Over at Thirty-Sixth and Prospect, in the midst of a quaint old neighborhood containing C.S.U.'s fraternity houses (among other attractions), stands a stately brick mansion house. Known as the "Library," this gracefully decaying former residence of some Captain of Industry or another has for a decade been one of the more interesting saloons in the city.

A half-dozen or more rooms comprise this tape-house, the atmosphere of which reminds one of a musty old private club complete with fireplaces, sturdy chairs and dimly lit old family portraits on the walls. Musing over a cold libation or two, the student may pass many a decadent evening lounging in the parlor or the drawing-room, or reposing by the grand-staircase, which is in contemplation of the lost times when persons of quality and merit (such as himself) could afford to live in such grand surroundings. For some little time the writer and his companions "studied" nightly at the "Library" while solving the problems of this beckoning planet, mourning lost sophisticates, or engaging in simiany worthless pursuits.

The writer humbly apologizes if the reader undertook his perusal of this little essay in hopes of uncovering the subtleties of a martini at "Swingo's" or the bouquet of wine at the "Inn on the Square." Nowhere in this space are to be found encomiums to the delights of disco, paens to the stimulation of sing'in bars, or any words of praise for the flashing light-show, rising-young-exter-ew!-executive, phony swinging high-life "night-club," or the popular with Andy's liquor boxes. Serious drinkers perform their task with a few select companions in dimly-lit, thread-worn places of faded grandeur, far away from the multi-colored dance floors and forced gaiety of the more trendy establishments. Those places the writer leaves to the social-climbers and the rah-rah-s.

By Steven S. Smith

The editors welcome contributions and suggestions relating to the saloons worthy of mention in the "Bar Review," and pledge to thoroughly investigate the quality of refreshment served in such establishments.

By Jeff Fisher

Are you one of the many students who will vote illegally this year?
Large numbers of college students are registering and voting illegally in their college towns, according to an article in the Spring issue of the Cleveland State Law Review written by Prof. Jonathan D. Reiff of Ohio University.

The article deals with student voting which, through a combination of events described in the article, has progressed to a state that many uneligible students are allowed to, and are even solicited to, register when they are actually nonresidents. They are thus voting illegally, wholly unaware of this fact and without any intent to do so.

Prof. Reiff points out that voters must be residents, and Ohio Revised Code section 3503.02(c) clearly states, "A person shall not be considered to have gained a residence in any county of this state into which he comes for temporary purposes only, without the intention of making such county his permanent place of abode."

"Most students are here in the county for a temporary purpose: education," says the author, and thus clearly fall within the prohibition in the statute. To be a legal resident one must have most of his ties to the local community, says Prof. Reiff, whereas a temporary resident has ties elsewhere. The facts of one's life control where his permanent residence is. Real residents have local car registration, local driver's licenses, do not leave town every time school is out, and do not list an address other than local on school records as their "home address," he noted.

Tom Jacklitch, the former supervisor of registration at the Board of Elections for Cuyahoga county, stated the criteria necessary for a student to register to vote are one must be eighteen years of age or older by election day, a United States citizen, in good standing with the community, and be living in the county at least thirty days prior to election. Intent of residence is also important, he mentioned, for if a person intends to live in Cuyahoga county and not just on a temporary basis, then that person may be considered a legal resident.

Those not qualified to register and vote but do so in violation of the state law are subject to fines up to $1,000 and/or imprisonment up to five years under O.R.C. 3599.12 for willful violation.

Prof. Reiff encourages all students to evaluate whether they have the ties to their college community that qualify them as legal residents, consult elections officials at the Board of Elections if in doubt, and register for absentee ballots at their permanent residence if not qualified locally.
Benchley handed him a Krugerrand and strode toward the gated elevator, peripherally noting the tall brunette in the Chariotte Ford dress, whose large grey eyes followed him across the lobby. As the porter hung his wardrobe in is closet, he walked out on the suite's balcony and drank it all in: the blue-green seas, the white beaches, the, well, British _ overseasness_ of the place. The amount the Agency paid him for these trips seemed steep to him, but all, he sighed, for God and Country. Though it had only been three hours, Law School already seemed a dim memory.

Brent selected a wool Cardin suit — Brooks Brothers simply don't do it in the Islands — and called the Martinique for reservations. He was interrupted by the re-entry of the porter with a bottle of icky French champagne, and a sealed note that read: "Good wine needs good company — don't you agree? Signed, S from the lobby."

"And how many in your party, Mr. Benchley?" the voice from the receiver asked.

"Better make it 2, for 9 p.m."

"And Charles — we may be a little late, say what, old chap?"

OCT. 3 — "Yeager, Wallace, Waiters.

Professor Oldenbohr intoned, reading off the computerized class list sent over from U.C. "Is there anyone's name here that I did not call? He looked up at the classroom of battle-weary faces, and saw no reply forthcoming. "Good. Now suppose, instead, that Corporation X's purchase did not come under the UCC?"

Another tier was skipped through the ranks as he shuffled for the seating chart. Somewhere, from the grey ceiling overhead, the ignobleties of Late October called from Brent. He looked up at the classroom of battle-weary faces, and saw no reply forthcoming. "Good. Now suppose, instead, that Corporation X's purchase did not come under the UCC?"

"Better make it 2, for 9 p.m."

"And Charles — we may be a little late, say what, old chap?"

...The Continuing Crisis...

By Steve Smith

students, an addition is deemed necessary, all of which betrays that the directors of campus planning suffer from an "edifice complex"... also at C.S.U., word reaches the editors of this obscure journal that a 2nd year student recently passed nearly an hour in the basement lounge without once playing a hand of cards, or recreating for friends his exploits in class, or dazzling other students with predictions of his brilliant future in the law: the student was actually studying. Disciplinary action is expected soon... The C.S.U. Conservative Union marks its 65th year this month by wondering if there remains in the Great Republic a worthy cause to fight... In a startling occurrence, a Cleveland-Marshall student and a Case Western Reserve student recently met on EQUAL TERMS. The meeting took place at McDonald's where the pair compared experiences. Unfortunately, the experiences were NOT equal: the Case student acquired 3-week work experience at Squirrel, Sandy and Dumpster, while the Cleveland-Marshall student labors for the "Kut-Rate Legal Clinic."... Finally, in response to numerous complaints that (a) all the time, half, and (b) half the time all of the copy-machine in the library stands destropised, (that's "busted" for you Gringos), the administration is considering installation of an indestructible auxiliary copier, to be located on the 17th floor of Fenn Tower Dorm, in a dazzling move which should prove a boon to the legal researcher.
An Interview with Charlie Smith

by M. Varga-Sinka

(Mr. Charles E. Smith while visiting Cleveland recently, granted an Interview with the GAVEL)

GAVEL: On the radio I heard you were a black member of the John Birch Society as well as former leftist-organizer. What did you do as a leftist and what accounts for the transformation in your political views?

Mr. Smith: I actually joined the Fair Play For Cuba Committee back in 1980. I had no idea it was run by communists. If there were a thousand people in Miami that would argue with me, I’d say only ten or fifteen were communists. They occupied every position. It was their organization in the first place. I was there six months and my wife said to me one day, “Can’t you see what you’re doing?” I said, “What?” She said, “Look, the communists have you and your friends in the street making all this trouble. Every time they want to solve the problem that you’ve created, they set up a committee in government and then they get appointed to the committee.”

A group of (members of) the Communist Party brought Caesar Chavez to my house and said, “This is the leader of the working man movement.” I thought Caesar Chavez was a wonderful leader, a wonderful man. He never killed anyone, never shot anyone, never calmed anyone. So, I would say that they’ve improved the quality of life in this country.

GAVEL: Doesn’t government exist to protect people from poverty, pollution and all the other ills that plague us?

Mr. Smith: Government exists to protect the life and property of the citizens. To catch and punish criminals. If we’re invaded, to make war. You cannot protect my property by taking it from me and giving it to someone else. You’re stealing! You cannot make war by taking my property. You can only do that by using my property. They call themselves “Internationalists.” They are in favor of abolishing our national sovereignty. At the very end of the Reagan-Anderson debate, Anderson said essentially that the problems in the world were being caused by “national identities.” The United States existing as a nation is somehow causing problems, so to solve this problem we have to strengthen international institutions like the United Nations. This is the merger. Even the Boy Scouts have as one of their highest badges, “World Citizen.” I’m a citizen of the United States; I’m not a “world citizen.” Eleanor Roosevelt was called by these “Liberals” the First Citizen of the World. I’m an American and you’re an American and I’m not interested in interfering in anyone else’s life. If another country wants to set up another kind of government, let them have it.

GAVEL: Do you think the bureaucracy has diminished our personal liberties? Some people feel that their quality of life has been improved because of government programs.

Mr. Smith: If a person feels that the quality of their life has been improved by government tampering, that person is by definition insane, just plain insane! Just consider the ordinary taxpayer. I didn’t say a grafter or bloodsucker or someone getting foodstamps. Ask him what are you receiving from the government? The answer is “Nothing. Nothing. Nothing!” Can’t name one thing. The grafter and the bloodsuckers think their quality of life has been improved but the trouble is, the problem is, that they’ve surrendered their responsibilities. They’ve been domesticated. Cattle won’t revolt. And these domesticated animals who are looking for food stamps and government handouts are never going to revolt against their rulers. They will simply vote in the “Liberals” who buy their votes promising them more. They no longer have the capacity or the will to go out and do for themselves.

Government has never solved anything. The bigger it gets, the more it costs me. I’m being taxed to death. By definition by quality of life has to decrease. I earn some money. It’s mine. I’m entitled to keep it and use it as I see fit. If I want to throw it away, it’s my business. If you want part of my money, you should do part of my work. I am in favor of redistributing the wealth in this country.

GAVEL: By what means?

Mr. Smith: By work! You work and get your fair share; I work and I’ll get mine. I’m not in favor of taking your money and giving it to some so-called unfortunate person. If you want to give your money, go right ahead, be my guest. If I want to do it, I’ll be my own guest. I propose a very simple solution to this problem: when a tax measure is put on the ballot, we should have the ballot constructed in such a fashion that you have a record of how people vote on the measure and those people who were in favor of paying that tax would pay it. Those who are against the tax wouldn’t pay it. I don’t want to prevent you from doing something you want to do! It’s 100 percent democratic. And since the “Liberals” tell us, it’s a wonderful thing, wonderful program. I can assure the all the “Liberals” are going to use it just to keep heaping taxes on themselves. I do not object to a man imposing a tax on me, object to a man imposing a tax on me. Make it voluntary.

What I propose in terms of bureaucracy is a state law prohibiting the state from collecting and using any tax money to develop, supplement, implement or be involved in any federal program. Half the money collected by the state government is not used to support the government and its legitimate functions.

That money is going to implement all these federal programs forced on the states by the bureaucrats (O.S.H.A., E.P.A., etc.). The reverse side of that coin is to have the House of Representatives cut off the revenue sharing funds.

The agencies should be abolished in the exact reverse order in which they were created. The first agency should be the so-called Department of Education; next would be the so-called Department of Energy. If we began in 1981, the programs created in 1980 would be eliminated. In 1982, all the expansion which took place in 1979 would be eliminated. In 1983, the corresponding year would be 1978. As you decrease the size of government, you reduce taxes. I can keep my money. When I buy goods, somebody has to work in order to produce them. If we adopted such a program, the United States would have to import labor in ten years because the private sector would have expanded so greatly.

If the House of Representatives, which controls all the money, cut off foreign aid in all its forms, the communist governments around the world would collapse. They cannot exist without foreign aid. I remember when Lyndon Johnson and his communist buddies Walter Rostow and Willard Wirtz and that crowd gave them laser beam technology. They said it was for medical research. There was the scheme in the 1940’s when they gave the Russians occupying East Germany the plates to print up their own money. They made that currency redeemable. The net result was that the communists printed up all this occupation money and cashed it for American gold. About 7 billion dollars worth.

In the Korean War, the American jets were fighting Russian jets and the Russian jets had Rolls-Royce engines. In Afghanistan, those tanks are made in the Kama River Truck Plant. Our government took several billion dollars of our money, gave it to the communists, brought the technicians over here and trained them at Ford Motor Co. and then sent Ford technicians over there to help them start up and run that plant. This is called “foreign aid” or “trade” but the goods all flow one way; the ball-bearing machines, the aircraft parts, the computers for their missiles, from us to them financed by traitors in Washington, D.C.
A CASE FOR COHEN

A small man but sinewy,
He removes his coat, folds it with care
And lays it aside.
He methodically "tucks up" his sleeves.

It's not that he's in a hurry;
But, if the thing's going to be done.
It's going to be done properly.

He kicks away the gravel and the brush
And chooses the spot
With an experienced eye.
He thrusts the shovel two or three times
And unwraps the thing.
Kneeling on the ground,
He pulls the filthy piece from the dirt
As though
It were the forgotten tablet
Which contains the secrets of our being . . . Or a treasure chest.

He rolls out the cloth
That pockets his few arcaic tools
... And begins.

He chips here and there
At the encrusted mud;
He carefully scrapes.
Finally . . . the brush!
He gently sweeps at this corner
And that crevice
And eventually begins to smile.

"There it is! Can you see it?"
See how the facets glisten,
The thing reflects man's passions
And weakness, his hurts and fears,
His hopes, his history and future,
His pettiness and his triumphs,
The reasonable and the unreasonable,
And the epitaphs of judges
Who tried to reckon with it all.

And he screams: "Can't you see it?"
The veins protrude from his forehead
As he paces around 'n round it.
"For God's sake and your own —
Can you see it!"

When he's sure
That they've seen all they were able,
He replaces it gently into the earth
And covers it once again.

He cleans his hands, unrolls his sleeves
And reclains his coat.
In silence
He departs and leaves behind him . . .
The hush
Of those who've seen
The innate come to life
And laugh and cry and die before their eyes.

— Laubenthal

Advice to the Law-Lorn by Senator Teddy

(Editor's Note: Senator Teddy, having suffered a recent set-back in his quest for the chief magistracy of the land, informs us that he graciously intends to forego more lucrative offers elsewhere and continue his solemn commitment to devote his efforts to advising young law students and other public servants, at least until something better comes along.)

Dear Senator Teddy,

As an up-and-coming law student active in Moot Court, S.B.A. and other activities of global importance, I need to know what sort of apparel the socially concerned and involved law student and young attorney is wearing in these modern times. You, a noted attorney and reknowned Solon, may perhaps assist me in selecting an appropriate wardrobe.

P.S. And also, is it true leisure suits have fallen from favor?

(signed) Concerned in Cleveland

Dear Concerned,

I, too, would be concerned were I in Cleveland. Huh-heh, a bit of the Teddy humor there. Seriously, the primary criterion in purchasing a suit of clothes is ample pocket-space: inside-jacket pockets, outside-jacket pockets, in-the-lining pockets, and so on.
In my service to all person-kind in the Senate, (and lately in my glorious campaign for the presidency), I have found these pockets to be quite convenient, indeed indispensable for secreting flasks and other small liquor bottles discreetly on my person. When the debate waxes long, and the heavy burden of spending the people's money grows tiresome, I find that a generous portion of a stimulating elixir rouses my rhetorical powers and gives me the vigor to energetically pursue the "taxing" nature of my high position on the Senate floor, (a bit more humor creeps through there.) In fact, I made several visits to my well-stocked vest-pocket before delivering my celebrated address to the assembled Democrat Convention a few weeks back. Pockets, my boy, contain the oil for the hinge on my door to success. No Senator would be without them, or their contents. In the frenzied pace of congressional duty an important vote on millions of dollars for social-science research on the "symbolic significance of monkey-shirts" may be followed in hectic short-order by a crucial vote on food-stamps for striking workers. This may leave scarcely enough time in between for a visit to a local saloon. The properly-equipped suit-coat thus assumes importance as a crucial legislative tool enabling countless Senators and Congress persons to be present and voting "yes" upon such enlightened legislation as the above examples.

Sadly, leisure suits are definitely out-of-fashion, although I personally found them quite tasteful and wore them often, for instance on weekend outings to Martha's Vineyard to visit with "friends." Alas, all that is past. As for the attire of the attorney, I have it in good authority that noted Professor of Law Early Curry-favor advises that even the youngest of Children should wear three-piece suits: at least, he continually tells his classes that "the law favors early vesting." (I believe I may have heard that phrase at law school, but someone else may have taken that test for me.)
I suggest you deck yourself out in a polyester three-piece with a loud multi-colored tie. You will then be right at home with other concerned, involved, rising young law students.

FOR COHEN

PAGE 7
An Interview with Charlie Smith

We ought to make this country secure by not helping the communists. At that point they'd collapse. We could then cut the Defense budget. We could then defend this country with the Alabama National Guard and a detachment of Black Panthers.

GAVEL: The priority of most people is their own well-being before anyone else's. When you have 40 million people who are considered to be poor, most activities prefer that the energy and resources be directed towards the and not some communist menace which is just a left over of the cold war era.

Mr. Smith: The communist menace is very real and it is from within this country. The communists are being kept in power in Soviet Russia to justify the taxes and the expansion (of government power) placed on the American people. Without the communist threat, you couldn't have a huge military budget. Carter initiated the world-wide arms embargo against tiny Nicaragua and put in the communist Sandinistas. Our government put in that communist Omar Torrijos. The next countries to fail will be El Salvador. Costa Rica is already gone. Morocco will go within a year.

We're dealing with a conspiracy. Changing from the so-called Democrats to the so-called Republicans and keeping the same Council on Foreign Relations members in all the time, switching from a Kissinger to a Vance, is like changing your dirty shorts: taking them off, turning them inside out and putting them on again. At first there appears to be a difference but as time goes on it makes little difference whether you change; and the more you change, the more everything seems to be the same.

This brings to mind what Daniel Webster said: "Good intentions will always be pleaded for every abuse of power." I've been looking at this for twenty years and I have no more doubts.

GAVEL: Isn't the John Birch Society another form of extremism?

Mr. Smith: No, unless you think patriotism is being extreme. Being loyal to an independent nation is good. Putting America first is good, not bad. Anderson and Carter put America last. I'm the taxpayer and ... I'm the biggest special interest group in the country. I'm not a minority. I'm not pushing for government control of anything. That's the way to judge Proposition 2. Don't look at who it's going to soak — forget about that nonsense, it's a smokescreen — it's for more government and higher taxes. I'm not in the least bit interested in how these characters say they're going to spend the money. They always have some "worthy cause" which they sell as pie-in-the-sky: blacks, poor whites, farmers, Chrysler, etc. — bailing out New York City. I'm tired of vote-buying with my money. Look at AP, UPI and INS and look at who controls them: all members of the Council on Foreign Relations. Whoever puts the news in is the one who is controlling it. You have a centralized distribution system for the news. You had unfavorable news to Somosa and favorable news to the Sandinistas. Unfavorable to the Shah of Iran and favorable to Khomeni. It's the same trick used in Cuba to turn Americans away from Battista. Castro even boasted, "I got my job through the New York Times.

GAVEL: Even the black student newspaper at CSU will have an article urging students to participate in "solidarity with oppressed peoples." (Why?)

Mr. Smith: If you can be made to think you are part of something larger, a "citizen of the world," a citizen of the third world, then you've already weakened the sense of identity of your being an American citizen protecting American interests.

I ran into this communist trick a long time ago: when I was working with the communists, I was at a meeting with them and I had all these Negroes with me — I had a group called the Freedom Now group. What they were trying to teach us was that we should act in the best interest of the Negro people. Now think about that: if you're so one-sided that you see an issue and you say "Well, how does this affect the Negro people?" There will be many, many issues which don't affect you at all. I said, "Why should we do things on the basis of race? Why should we ask 'How's this affect black people?'" If something happens in Poland, obviously it doesn't affect the Negroes. We should turn our backs on them but they're in slavery, too. So these communists masquerading as Jews said, "... you should do it too, everyone else is." "What do you mean, 'everybody else'?'" "Oh yes," they said, "this is what the white man in the South did." I said, "Is that right?" "This is what the Irish did." I said, "Is that right? Is that what the Jews are doing?" He said yes. I said, "Alright, you tell me something; how does teaching me to be a racist benefit the Jewish people." They couldn't answer.

You can see how successful they've been if they can get women to take a stand on "how does this affect women," get an old person, "how does this affect the elderly," how does this affect this group or that group — they weaken the identity and we wind up being a bunch of groups fighting among ourselves. And of course, we wind up getting sold government programs that supposedly benefit the Negroes and the women . . .

GAVEL: Assuming the events of the last twenty years or so had not happened, if there had not been a Martin Luther King, marches on Washington, the Civil Rights Act; what would the economic/political position be of the black American today?

Mr. Smith: If there hadn't been a Martin Luther King, the communists would have created one — in fact, King was their invention in the first place. They invented those movements. The Negroes did not invent Martin Luther King. The situation would have been the same. They invented Angela Davis; made her a national figure; put her on CBS news. Who selects the person to go on national news?

GAVEL: How should a law student prepare for a future that in your estimation looks rather bleak?

Mr. Smith: Every law student should read the Constitution and the Federalist Papers. Successive generations of students have been taught that there is an "implied powers" clause in the Constitution. The actual doctrine you're being taught is the doctrine enunciated by Charles Evans Hughes and then picked up by that (I think) outright communist Felix Frankfurter. "The Constitution is whatever the Supreme Court says it is." What's the Constitution for, then? If you can just rip it up, put the wrong guys on the court and they change one thing and then put other guys on with different political philosophies and they change it the other way. You haven't got a Constitution.

Law students, most of them, ought to be horsewhipped.

GAVEL: Why is that?

Mr. Smith: They've surrendered their morality. They've surrendered their good sense. (They) ought to be fighting for our rights instead of going along with bureaucratic schemes.
ON
POLITICIANS
AND
OTHER
BOZOS

By Steven S. Smith
A Great Carnival is once again unleashed to barnstorm the four-corners of the far-flung Republic. A traveling menagerie and sideshow replete with upmanaged clowns, exotic animals, bizarre freaks and purveyors of gorgeous gew-gaws. The tent is up and the parade of oddities and hilarities has begun, the great quadrennial political circus is on!

Let us begin by taking a short stroll down the Funway to the Liberal Salvation Show, where the grinning carnival Barker is about to speak! "My fellow Americans, step right up, don't push, don't shove. I am Jimmy C., your dragoman and guide for a journey into an array of fabulous festivities. She walks, she talks, she accuses anyone who supports real jobs rather than degraded welfare a "racist!" She does a slinky dance, she whispers promises in your ear, promises of no work and more play for everybody, (except the middle classes!)

Don'tcha know I mean our own Patty Harris, Secretary of Health and Welfare? Step right up, get your food-stamps for strikers, food-stamps for students, low-rent, no-rent housing? Get your welfare checks here, sign-up for one, sign-up for another? Don't push, don't shove, there's plenty for everyone, (except the taxing working classes)!

"Right here, friends, on our Funway, the Great Judge Bad-teach-y will be performing wondrous experiments on the Constitution to determine whether or not the Founding Fathers intended that Cleveland-Marshall students be bused to Western Reserve. We know his power is in the Constitution, he'll find it there somewhere, once he gets his famous "elastic claws" on it! Perhaps it's in the Prohibition Amendment, or maybe hidden in the "No State shall create any title of nobility" clause.

One final word, friends and neighbors! For your edification and amusement you will shortly see a moving picture, a tee-vee advertisement for the re-election of your Great President, me. It will show you the Great Man at work, both alone and conferring with other Leaders such as Warden Brezhnev of the Soviet Workers' Paradise. It will speak in grandiose platitudes of the awesome burden of my high office. What it will NOT do is speak of my past record. I advise you, my friends, I warn you and caution you to ignore and cast from your minds the malicious references to my past record emanating from my ignoble opponent! Forget the past, my friends, forget what has gone before, forget my record. Listen instead to the glorious vision of the sylvan future which I detail for your believing ears! Armed with this vision, (and your tax dollars), we the People can create a new America, an America of Plenty for those groups with political clout, and Plenty of Nothing for those who pay for it All!"

Hew! Let's perambulate down the Funway. There's the sideshow, where former Congress-being and present fat-woman Bellow Abzug is about to assume centerstage. She's careening wildly, she's rocking and reeling to the hoohoo-coo, and the Women of the Fevered Brow accompany her with a grand chorus of "I Am Woman." She begins to speak, and she demands free Federal abortion for unwanted children, free Federal day-care for "wanted" children, free-love, free-thinking, and free-ice-cold lemonade! Her clown-hat is splendidious and she's got pie all over her face! The spectacle is stupefying!

Now here come the leaders of the unions, parading up the Funway in chauffured Lincolns and Mercedes. What heroic champions of the Little Man! The workers are gathering about them throwing money. The leaders are promising fewer hours, lower productivity, more pay and a host of new Federal programs which will fuel inflation to eat-up the pay raise and then some. The workers love it! They're lifting the leaders on their shoulders, they're carrying them aloft in the Lincolns and Mercedes. They're throwing more money into baskets labeled "Union Pension Fund," and the leaders are promising to use it wisely, to treat it as if it were their own, in fact they're even offering to TAKE it as their own! What self-less love of the Common People!

There seems to be a bit of a commotion further down the Funway. Ah, it's the Shell Game, of course, a "little game of chance" as the great W.C. fondly termed it. The clever carny is reeling some of the shells about with amazing celerity, and the stakes run high. Under this shell is inflation, recession, gigantic Federal debt, and 69 billions in taxes each year to pay the interest alone! Under the next shell is a veritable candy store of new Federal goodies and gum-drops: there's Federal health-care, Federal energy production, Federal land-use regulation and more, each one without question destined to display the celebrated efficiency of the Federal Post Office Department!

The carny shifts the shells about with matchless sleight-of-hand and hints that under the third shell will be found a Congress controlled by the same Democrat Party for 25 years in a row, and for 48 of the past 50 years. You choose that shell, but nothing is there! Because the results of this monopoly power are under the other two shells and those responsible are out campaigning for re-election! Not campaigning upon their records, oh, no, but upon their promises for the New Age about to dawn, just around the next corner! A New Age of free animal-crackers, in which the peoples' money will ALL be taken from them and spent wisely, by Peerless Leaders, spent upon Bread, and upon Circuses! Bring on the peanuts and beer! On with the show!
Interview With SBA President Henry Hilow

The following is an interview with Student Bar Association President Henry Hilow, conducted by GAVEL editor Ken Callahan.

GAVEL: Henry, last spring, in the throes of an admittedly close election, you ran on a promise to "open up" SBA. How are you implementing that policy?

Hilow: C-M, both students and faculty, consists primarily of commuters. We have sought, and succeeded in getting, many to serve student government who had not before - while not excluding those involved in the past. Generally, things have been real good, and people very cooperative.

GAVEL: One of the perennial problems here has been that of the failure of SBA Senators to attend meetings. How do you feel about a constitutional amendment requiring attendance?

Hilow: I strongly support that. A student government is only as strong and beneficial as those who support it. But that implies a responsibility on the part of those elected to be accountable.

Just because we are a commuter school, in an urban environment, doesn't lessen that responsibility — indeed, it adds to it. Any one who takes a role in the Senate will be expected to take an active role in communicating with the students, to learn the real concerns of the students.

GAVEL: What are you doing about Placement services?

Hilow: For various reasons, the Placement Committee did not meet last year. This year, two students — Sharon Ljubi and Allison Kerrester — will meet once a month regularly with Nancy Goldman. I would like to encourage all students to take an active role early on, and not wait until 3rd year.

Also, we have been keeping in touch with the Alumni Association, and trying to get them to take a role in finding students jobs.

GAVEL: How does SBA look financially?

Hilow: Mark Mastrangelo has done a great job with the situation he inherited. The books were in bad shape, there were no records of monies going in and out. SBA is fortunate to have Mark in the position he is in (Treasurer). He spent most of the summer putting the books in order. The long and short of it is, our financial prospects look good, and we should be able to meet the needs of the various organizations.

GAVEL: Word has it that SBA has a number of new projects in the offering.

Hilow: Things that have been traditionally done in the past — the Follies, the Formal Dance — will continue.

This year, however, we're going to try to organize what we call a "Barrister's Ball." C-M has a very distinguished alumni — approximately 40 Marshall graduates sit on various benches. We hope they will get together a formal dinner dance with these people, the law school is an excellent setting to do so.

In addition, we're planning a plant sale to help raise funds, which we would be willing to distribute on a proportional basis with any organization that would want to get involved. Also, our Speakers Bureau is continuing its search.

Basically, we are pursuing programs that are geared to involve students in the school — for example, the Halloween Party — to provide social, as well as academic opportunity. That is the difference between this and the undergraduate setting: it is important to help develop professional relationships now.

GAVEL: How do you respond to complaints about the new library policies?

Hilow: I think that it is essentially a good and ultimately necessary idea. We must remember, again, that Cleveland-Marshall exists in an urban environment, a fact that presents certain limited security problems. As a result, a couple of incidents have taken place which convinced a number of people that I.D. checking would be good for the students in the long run.

As for the typewriter policy, this too was considered to be in the interests of the students in the long run. For example, a number of typewriter balls were reported missing last year. The 5 dollar fee will be used to insure the prudent use of the machines, and will be used to provide proper maintenance throughout the year.

GAVEL: Were you satisfied with the results of the Book Exchange this year?

Hilow: Richard Kemme really took charge. Because of his hard work, and the infinite number of hours he volunteered over the summer, we took in a great number of books, and — more importantly - sold a great number of books. We were blessed with a lot of cooperation — for example, Rich Marco at Law Review allowed us to use his offices, which allowed student buyers an opportunity to browse.

Although the success reflects on the SBA, it is really an example of good people who cared enough to volunteer.

GAVEL: How do you see Happy Hours progressing this year?

Hilow: Their success is really predicated on the response of the students. Our first Happy Hour, with the incoming class, went over real well.

We're going to try to experiment with Thursday night Happy Hours, at times when they seem least likely to interfere with classes. Also, we will attempt to limit them to 2 1/2 hours, so as not to invite problems.

GAVEL: Finally, how much time will SBA officers put into the job this year?

Hilow: Someone will be in our office at least 5 hours a day to answer student questions, and our hours will be posted on the door. For night students, we will be open from 5-6 p.m. several nights a week.

As for now, our office is always open. The students here are really lucky to have the heads of student organizations that they have — at BALS, THE GAVEL, Woman's Caucus, Law Review, NLG, Frats. There is the type of spirit here that could propel us into a great and productive year.
YOU'RE GETTING YOUNGER


The first in the continuing series will be Irving Younger, who will speak on "A Different View of Deregulation." The lecture will take place in the Moot Court Room, on Thursday, November 6, at 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Younger is a graduate of Harvard Law, and is a professor of Trial Techniques at Cornell. His most recent published work is Materials for the Basic Course in Evidence.

DEGRADED AND DEFLOWERED

The Dean recently distributed to the Law Faculty a letter from John Flower, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, which took the Faculty to task for its rather dismal record for prompt grading.

The letter was, well, rather to the point. In pointing to the delinquency of 40 percent of the Faculty in turning in grades for Spring Quarter, Mr. Flower also noted the "disappointing lack of concern for law students," the "willful disregard of professional obligations" and the "lack of attention to a professional requirement that is absolutely appalling" among some faculty members.

Significantly, Mr. Flower stated that these facts will be reviewed when "salary improvements" are determined for the next academic year.

LOCKER STORE HELD UP

Due to a windfall in available space, S.B.A. announced that there remains locker space available for those who might still desire it. Contact Liz Levitt in LB 28.

BUT THEY HAVEN'T LOST THEIR IDEALS

The June graduate class of 1980 has been highly successful in its placement search. Nancy Goldman is pleased to relate. A recent survey indicates that at least 76 percent of their numbers have been placed thus far, to the average tune of $18,470. That's up $1,000 from last year. In addition, 17 are Federal Court Clerks.

THE STAFF OF LEGENDS

THE GAVEL is looking for staff members to write for the paper. First and second-year students are particularly sought, especially for leadership positions in the coming years. No previous writing or photography is required.