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"A HARD-HEADED WOMAN AND A SOFT-HEARTED MAN, HAVE BEEN THE CAUSE OF TROUBLE SINCE THE WORLD BEGAN."

— Elvis Presley, 1958
Sirs:

Your editorial in the December, 1980 issue of The Gavel wrung my aging heart. Obviously, you are suffering the slings and arrows of editorship and enjoying every minute of it. But it is painful to think of your weltenschmerz and ego-expansion struggling for dominance in your inky labors.

In the fifties, the Gavel editors yearned only for the joy of not being scorned by Western Reserve law students. In the sixties, they shouted, “Down with everything that is up!” In the seventies, they alternated between “Hell no, we won’t go” and “throw the bum out.” So now it is “We are more moral and, economically wise than you; which we know to be so because we just won an election.”

As a longtime faculty member (and other things) at dear old C-M from 1956 to 1974, I have observed many Gavel their travails and soulsearching. So it is as an old friend of C-M that I say to you: “Comfort ye, my friend; this too will pass,” and ye too will pass into the hosts of forgotten editors after your brief moment in the sun.

From the safety and warmth of sunny Florida, I send good wishes to y’all and gently suggest: “Keep your shirt on, because the law is a seamless web.” When you’ve figured that sequitor out, you’ll be a wise one indeed.

I can hardly wait to see what the next editorial age will bring. Perhaps extraterrestrial yearnings!

Sincerely,
Howard L. Oleck
D.P. of Law (CM) Emeritus;
Prof. of Law (Stetson)

---

Sirs:

At this time, I feel that it is my duty as both an elected student official and concerned member of the Cleveland-Marshall community, to name my successor to my duly elected position as Student Bar Association Sergeant-At-Arms. This decision has not been made hastily.

The duties of this office are such that I could not in good conscience face my impending graduation without due reflection and concern. The office of Student Bar Association Sergeant-At-Arms carries with it the utmost responsibility and trust. Naturally, the job has many prerequisites. The Sergeant-At-Arms must be a responsible law student with a respectable grade point average and a showing of involvement in C-M activities. The Sergeant-At-Arms must also demonstrate the utmost dedication to the task of intellectually and physically combating all law school bimbos (you know the kind I mean). Honor students, of course, are suspect. Although my shoes are hard to fill, I believe I have successfully solved the dilemma of my own replacement. Through the power vested in me as Sergeant-At-Arms and the meanest person at Cleveland-Marshall, I hereby appoint the following into the position of SBA Sergeant-At-Arms: Henry Hilow, Liz Levitt, Frank Palladino, Rich Pignatiello, Tim Rose, Ken Callahan, Mean Joe Green, Hell’s Angels - Cleveland Chapter, and Stewart the Cop.

Working together, these people may be able to fill the position of Sergeant-At-Arms as efficiently and effectively as I have. My record speaks for itself. Not once, since my reign began, has there been any gunfire within these hallowed halls. Not once has there been an incident which I was unable to control. I can only hope that my

Joe Zone

---

Readers: please note that THE GAVEL informed two professors and members of two organizations re this issue requesting their own particular views. No submissions were made.

"Honestly, if you’re going to wear necklaces, I wish you’d buy your own."

---
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By M. Varga-Sinka

Women have always distinguished themselves when they possessed the will to do so. Legislation was never required to insure either the production or the importance of the cultural, social or scientific contributions which they made. "Women's Liberation" and its "contributions" being nothing more than the legacy of legitimate emanicipation but rather to the history of political radicalism. The entire slew of Liberation propaganda is nullified with a simple observation and profound truth: men and women are different. The reams of opinion predicated upon the hypothesis of a gender-free equality are false from basic premise to convoluted extrapolations. It is an aberration divorced from reality, historical orthodoxy and scientific probity. It is an essentially upper middle-class, indeed beau monde, movement which tries to extend its appeal by using the problems of the poorest women in the community as a justification for its political extremism. The token support which they receive from the poor or the misguided serves to conceal the very real differences in the needs and outlooks of these various groups of women. Like every form of political radicalism, it contains the seeds of its own destruction — quite similar to what Malcolm Muggeridge has often referred to as the "Liberal deathwish."

While the self-appointed leadership of Liberation may consider itself an enlightened elite, it is actually a motley group of muddled pseudo-intelectuals transferring their neuroses onto all women. One need only consider their ill-remembered unhappy childhoods or well-remembered miserable marriages hysterically projected onto all relationships and childhoods to find the true source of their "compassion" and "justice," more properly characterized as vengeance. In its anxiety to avoid an oligarchical structure, Liberation has succumbed to the tyranny of charismatic-demagogic leadership. In return, this leadership has given them nothing more then mythical inferences based on false assumptions. A perfect example of this is the myth that women have been discriminated against in salaries and promotions because they are women. Salaries are normally determined by supply and demand. Women between the ages of 25 and 59 are 11 times more likely than men to leave work voluntarily, and the average woman spends only eight months on a job compared to almost three years for a man. Another example would be women who must live where their husbands are employed thus constraining their mobility. The lower pay (if any) is not the effect of discrimination but of locational preference. In both instances, a strictly business decision or geographic consequence is twisted into a curious mixture of male oppression and economic envy.

Sensible women insist on equal status for distinctively female roles. Liberation demands the abolition of any such distinctive role; they expect the achievement of equality through identical patterns of behavior. They seek a world where human relationships involve no effort, no responsibility, and the guarantee of success in advance. FemLib Fanatics argue that "men are the oppressors, a highly privileged group." Sensible women know that it is not only harder to be a man, in the true sense of the word, it is also harder to become one. They know that women do not have a monopoly on fear, depression, frustration, failure, futility or self-contempt. Fanatics consider chivalry to be a vast male conspiracy to keep oppressed women submissive. They find their feminality by punishing men for their maleness. For the sensible woman, it is a pleasure, a gesture of care and respect usually taught and reinforced by both parents.

Liberation discriminates in ways which men never imagined: the "problems of women" are discussed incessantly — read any issue of "Ms." or "Working Women's News" and try to find the male-equivalent; men's problems, which in fact show a man's fate to be more extreme, are either ignored or simply mocked.

Each individual develops according to his determination or irresolution. Women have distinctive abilities and qualities; once these are recognized and given equal value and esteem, the aim should be "more than parity" in jobs where these female qualities are most important rather than parity in all jobs. It would be better if women were to use parity of numbers in each occupation as the test of the end of discrimination, and it would be a disaster if they then made futile attempts to achieve this by outflanking girls' upbringing so that only male qualities were valued and inculcated.

These innate differences reflect the basic historical division of labor between sexes. Liberation ignores this and assumes that men and women are infinitely malleable. Come to think of it, so did Robespierre — if Frenchmen would not be free and virtuous voluntarily, then he would force them to be free and cram virtue down their throats — as well as Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, FDR, Skinner and Mao (John's华丽的newspaper would have slaughtered 30-odd million of his fellow Chinese). We must give equal time: so did Anna Pauer, as does Angela Davis, Patricia Wald, Bella Abzug and too many others who exist only to insult their gender, country and cultural heritage.

There is a common touchstone for this political radicalism and social engineering but it is rarely if ever discussed: atheism. All of the Jews who developed and operated the concentration camps in the Soviet Union (which to date have butchered over 66 million human beings) were atheists; all of the camps under German control during WW II were similarly managed by atheists who had abandoned Christianity with the rise of Nazism. Gloria Steinem once wrote "By the year 2000 we will, I hope, raise our children to believe in human potential (Secular Humanism), not God." The Humanist Manifesto II was signed by Betty Friedan, founder of the National Organization of Women (N.O.W.), and it stated quite explicitly: "No deity will save us, we must save ourselves. Promises of immortal salvation or fear of eternal damnation are both illusory and harmful."

The analogy is neither extreme nor fanciful. Just as Liberalism, because of its intrinsic nature, leads to Facism (state control without state ownership) and the consequent destruction of a nation, so atheism or Secular Humanism leads to the destruction of man as individual, as family, as civilization. One can dispense with analogies by relying on actions which always speak louder than words. Read Steinem, Friedan, Millett, Greer, de Beauvoir, any of them as I have — silly Mormons and stupid Catholic nuns are merely useful distractions — unless you wish to be like so many ardent FemLib Fanatics that I have encountered who have never read (and refuse to read) Phyllis Schlafly or Arianne Stassinopoulos. Their ideas in comparison, are stabilized upon the knowledge that man's worth, integrity and sanctity is neither conferred nor protected by the Constitution or another amendment to it, but by a higher law and authority.

The image of men always privileged, always at the top is like all propaganda: disproportionate, deceptive and insulting. One need only consider that crime is predominantly a male activity; divorced men are three times more likely to commit suicide than divorced women; sixty percent of the male inmates of mental institutions have never been married; single men were twice as likely as single women to suffer from impaired mental health; unattached males are 25 to 50 percent less happy than their married counterparts; most sex offenders are male as are tramps, derelicts and cannon-fodder with which Liberators now seek parity for reasons even cannon-fodder cannot fathom.
"Bar Review: " Past & Present
The Great Cleveland State
Saloon Series

By Steve Smith

During the holiday season just past, a friend from your humble servant's days at Mentor High School journeyed North from balmy Florida to the frozen and desolate City by the Lake. The writer desired to show him a night on the town in the Big City, and a mutual friend suggested that the larger part of the evening be passed with him at an establishment known as the "Mistake," located in the downstairs of the Agora at 24th Street by Chester Avenue.

Now, the Agora was well known for its rock and roll during the mid-to-late Sixties, hosting such Mid-Western phenomena as "Bob Seger and the Last Heard" (who had such regional hits as "Heavy Music" and "Ramblin' Gamblin' Man" years before achieving national stardom), "Terry Knight and the Pack" (who hit with "Mister, You're a Better Man than I") before going on to become "Grand Funk Railroad") and the Cleveland group "The James Gang" (whose lead guitarist on "Funk 49" and other hits was Joe Walsh). As will become all too readily apparent, those days are gone.

The "Mistake" is similar to the lost and lamented "Downunder" once at 24th and Euclid in that both were below-ground bars, but there ends the similarity. The ancient stone walls and numerous dark rooms and corners of the old "D.U." lent charm to that establishment. Charm, however, is not one of the "Mistake's" stronger points, nor are the $3.00 cover charge and the $1.50 per beer price.

The first attraction (if one may so term a band whose volume-level and melodic range match those of a pile-driver), was an assemblage of young men calling themselves "Wombats." The lead singer of this group hopped about the stage on tip-toe, and the lead guitarist appeared to be at least 16, and possibly even 17 years of age.

The "Wombats" lack only a few insignificant attributes of stardom, such as singing ability, song-writing talent and proficiency at their chosen instruments. Evidently to compensate, the "Wombats" crank-up the volume several dozen decibels for each of these minor shortcomings until lyric, melody, harmony and even lack-of-talent are lost in an ear-splitting din of dis-jointed rhythm, beat, and tip-toed hopping about the stage.

To the rise-and-fall of this roar, a vast host of teeny-boppers, college students, high-schoolers with phony I.D.'s, and assorted low-life trendsetters hopped about the dance floor in a Devo-like dance of dementia. It would seem that even such elementary dance steps as the writer used to observe and engage during the days of heavy-metal hard rock over at "Fat Glen's" have been forsaken, at least by the gang at the "Mistake" and other such New Wave places.

When the Wombat organization was pleased to conclude its performance, a local disc-jockey announced that the next spectacle to take the stage would be the group "Hammer Damage." Seizing this opportune moment to as much by the inhospitality as well as the temperatures of the city, was faced with the rueful alternatives of either calling it a night, or else returning to the "Mistake." The latter course seemed the less objectionable, at least at the time, and so the "Mistake" was re-entered.

The whirling teeny-derivishes were now even more frantically hopping and bouncing about the floor as the closing act, the "Wild Giraffes," blasted forth their particular conception of rock and roll. Sounding at times faintly reminiscent of classic 50's rock and at other times like good mid-60's rock, the Giraffes' overall performance was nevertheless tainted by the same incomprehensible staccato vocal delivery, poor material and, (most objectionably of all), devastating decibels which characterized the less-talented "Wombats" and, presumably, "Hammer Damage." The writer holds no brief against loud rock, but recognizes the simple fact that volume levels appropriate to, say, the Coliseum, are not in good taste in such confined quarters as the "Agora" basement.

Real rock and roll, created single-handedly by Elvis Presley, Chuck Berry and Jerry Lee Lewis, lasted about five years in the 50's, had a brief resurgence in the 60's, but has surfaced only upon rare occasion since. Rock and roll is simple music, really, but well structured with interesting chord progression, tempo and drum work. It is the absence of these qualities which most clearly distinguishes the Dreaded Disco robot drone from good music. New Wave and Punk, however, merit scant attention the latter's искусств.). The next time this writer entertains out-of-town acquaintances, it will be a better time, a better view, and at better prices, Namely listening to oldies on the radio, drinking a cold six-pack of Stroh's, sitting down at the 9th Street Pier.

"Some day, daughter, this will all be yours."
EMANCIPATED, NOT LIBERATED

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3

FemLiberalism has already had its effects, the most repugnant of which is the idea that a woman with a job, better yet, a "career," is more of a woman, more fulfilled indeed more valuable than an "ordinary housewife." Is there anything more boring than a man with a "career"? Ask a divorcée whose former husband devoted more time to his career than to what ought to have been his priorities: his wife and family. The average father in the U.S. spends 12 minutes a day with his child. One of our city's largest law firms has a divorce rate among its lawyers in excess of 44 percent; it is presently discouraging overtime work by its lawyers for this reason.

They treated housewives with contempt until February 6, 1979, when the E.R.A. movement declared that "it's O.K. to be a housewife and wear make-up and dress the way you feel." In the meantime, your friendly local telephone operator suddenly realized that all she ever wanted to do was climb a pole. The feds via C.E.T.A. spent $65,000 for a muscle-building program for women who wanted to become industrial workers and the like. Explained Joe Rodgers, a C.E.T.A. official in Pittsburgh, "We teach women to lift heavy weights so they can work in the steel mills." But while feds and fools engaged in reverse evolution, the millions of sensible, emancipated housewives and working women who knew their priorities—that a family and its maintenance is far more noble, important and fulfilling than receiving a gold watch after twenty years of service—simply ignored the feminists and exercised their free wills for many years before that announcement was ever made.

E.R.A. was brought to its slow but sure death not by men who just happen to compose the majority in each of the state legislatures which have ratified this fascist amendment but by women ... particularly housewives. See Yale Law Journal, Volume 80, Number 5, April 1971, p. 944, 945.

FemLib legislation such as E.R.A. degrades the role of women as homemakers and supports economic development that would require women to seek careers. "By 1990, only one woman out of four will be able to stay home with their children, even when they're little," Friedan once said. "All the others will be working." This in turn would necessitate the state development of child care centers which only helps the state consolidate more power over the family unit. Ridiculous? Who would have thought twenty years ago that by sending your child to a public school, the state would have the final determination as to which school that child would ultimately attend?

Where E.R.A. has failed to influence social change either as an idea or through economic blackmail ("boycott"), other tools were and are at hand to accomplish dramatically the same goal. Dr. Mary Calderone a leader in Planned Parenthood and the Sex Education and Information Council of the U.S. once asked: "If man, as he is, is obsolete, then what kind do we want in his place and how do we design the production line? ... In essence, that is the real question facing sex education."

Her production line begins (ideally) at birth: is nurtured in a federal day care system; fostered in public education; and will hopefully extend into every aspect of life even unto the Armed Forces under the usual pretext of "equality." She is no doubt pleased with the efforts being made to draft women. The push for drafting women and putting them in foxholes (also symptomatic of the deathwish) is nothing more than another giant social welfare program designed to provide "upward social mobility" for "minorities" which, according to their peculiar definitions, includes women. As a point of fact, women comprise the majority of the population and also possess the majority of wealth in this country.

The uni-sex army is not a foreboding. It exists (except for ladies in foxholes). Illegitimate births, which increase with every passing year, receive equal honour and financial rewards with legitimate births. In the most recent issue of Army Reserve Magazine: "Pregnant soldiers now have a uniform all their own ... Pregnant soldiers will be issued two uniforms at no cost; a medical proof of pregnancy and the appropriate issue record form are the (only) required documents." Also, "a black uni-sex windbreaker should be hitting the PX any day now. It's an optional item of wear for all soldiers."

Although the U.S. has fought nine wars and never drafted a single woman, and although the Constitution gives Congress (not the courts) the power to raise armies, will the Supreme Court now rule that women must be drafted when men are drafted? That is the question posed by a case now pending before the Supreme Court, Basker v. Goldberg. A Federal District Court said "yes" calling it "sex-discriminatory" to draft men only. That court itself, by the way, decided the fate of women without ever hearing a single argument from or on behalf of women. Because of the discriminatory exclusion, women's arguments, 16 young women between the ages of 18 and 26, all subject to registration and induction if the Selective Service Act were sex-neutral, (unlike Gloria or Bella or any of the other over-aged patriots). They then turn to other things that the legislative history of the Selective Service Act demonstrates that the arguments made by the young women were important to Congress in its decision to exempt all women from registration and the draft. However, the Justices are not prepared to defend the male-only draft law, refuses to use this testimony. Other testimony before the House Armed Services Committee will not be used but is equally compelling, to wit, Brig. General Johnson, who declared: "The Women's Army Corps. 'Women cannot match men in aggressiveness, physical stamina, endurance and muscular strength in long-term situations...I do not doubt the Army has women who will complete a combat course, endure three days or three weeks under field conditions and shoot as straight as any man. But in my whole lifetime, I have never known 10 women whom I thought could endure three months under actual combat conditions in an Army unit. I have no doubt whether or not women who should serve in combat is a matter of equal rights; it is not a matter of equal opportunity — as much as some might have us think it is. It is not a matter of justice that can be decided in a court by lawyers and judges. It is a matter of whether we are going to preserve the things our nation stands for. I think it stands for preserving the things we have treasured for 200 years: our Constitution, our flag, our family life. All of these things have been threatened in our lifetime, but none more than the family life. The words of an eminently sensible woman!

But what can we do to tidy up this unfortunate little mess? As educated individuals, a proper use of language is essential to maintain all that we value and efforts should be made to speak and write correctly. The FemLib Fanatics believe that under the conditioning mechanisms that inhibit women, language works the greatest influence. Because of this, they demand sweeping reforms: i.e., we must change our language so that we can change our ways of thinking. Examples: they want humanity, instead of mankind; artificial, instead of mammal; women, instead of girls or ladies; femininity instead of libber. By removing "sex biased words" from our vocabulary (but not limited to) "he, she, manpower, chairman, mother, sir, coed, father, womankind, his, hers, housewife, policeman..." so on, the dawn of a new age (beginning or culminating in 1984) will be prepared for all of us equally. "Sexism" like "Ms." and other bogus, nonexistent words have been accepted by editors, administrators, the illiterate and misguided (no pun intended). A Gallup poll in 1973 showed the 67 percent of unmarried females preferred to be called "Miss" compared to 19 percent who wanted "Ms."; 67 percent married preferred "Ms.;" 89 percent rejected it.

The English language is no more "sexist" than the Russian: Both are communist and yet a businessman was forced to change the wording of a classified ad from "foreman" to "foreperson" with the explanation that ads had to comply with the Federal Civil Rights Act and the (state) Fair Employment Practices Act. Interpreters of those acts follow the Department of Labor listings of occupational titles which avoid gender-specific terms; for example, "batperson" instead of "baby boy." In 1976 the U.S. Civil Rights Commission sent a
By Steven S. Smith

Unhappily for the Republic, certain individuals of the fair sex have betaken themselves to the dives and dregs of the society into the inferno swamps of ideology. As is well known, women of the fevered brow comprise but a fraction of the feminine population of the country, they nevertheless form a coherent group the influence of which is compounded by the fact that its members are largely found in the professions, in the academy, and in the manufactories of France. Particularly is this true in the broad sphere of politics, where such a woman is said to be "public opinion," (which is, generally, the mere blatherings of any given commentator; representing any given network or newspaper; and expressing any given view, so long as this latter is Liberalism.) All of which is not to say that vapors of ideology are inhaled only in the higher levels of society; one regularly encounters saucy, gum-chewing salesgirls who entertain the fantasy that the perusal of Ms. magazine betwixt customers entitles them to membership in the intelligentsia.

It is, of course, not to be wondered at, that many women are inured to the lot of home-maker in the present time. Surely, the "home" of the present age is but a shadow of true home-life as recently as a century ago. Ties of family bind the generations each to the next in an unending chain of being from time immemorial and, properly maintained, these ties give meaning to each individual's life, and place the hardships and joys of this world in their proper perspective.

Regrettably, the chain of generations in most families has today been broken, and much of the traditional life of the limited family stems from its isolation. Moreover, the aged are placed in misnamed old-age "homes" or else left to subsist upon Federal "social security" and are cut-off from the activity of the world. (It was not so when great-grandfather still held title to the family homestead, as his father before him, and his son after would in his stead. In that former time, age and its wisdom were, of necessity, accorded the deference due them.)

The decline in communal life has also isolated individuals and thus provided kindling for the fires of discontent. In a better age, women like men did not labor outside the home or outside the community. Today they often do both or, among the leisure classes, improve their time viewing the sordid morass of day-time television. Former ages saw women of the family and village assisting at working the farms, baking together, and making clothing together. Quilting and other crafts offered social intercourse as well as producing materials to brighten the homestead. Child-rearing was taken care of as a group, by those with family ties rather than with the impersonal bureaucratic disinterest of the government "day-care" institution.

And the Church, as center of communal life, fostered Christian precepts of voluntary assistance to one's neighbors and kin. Moral principle defined the mutual and reciprocal rights and duties which bound husband to wife, child to parent, and family to the social order.

Men as well labored in natural groups: son, cousin, father and grandfather worked the land that their ancestors before them had walked upon. With their neighbors they guided the community. A shared interest in community well-being, the common-weal, was everywhere recognized. The town could be tolerated, but the depredations of those disposed to violence and rapacity were dealt with after the fashion they deserve.

Modern Western society lavishes praise upon its vaunted economic and spatial "mobility," yet these attributes must of necessity, be limited appropriately to the more defined communal values: community has vanished; towns and cities are mere aggregations of houses which contain ever-changing tenants; "homes" have ceased to exist in many instances; even friendship has declined until it becomes, in Dr. Johnson's words, "mere confederations in vice or leagues in folly." The Church of the modern age has turned its back upon the fundamental Truths which once made this civilization distinguishable from the heathen and the barbarian: repentance and faith in Christ transform the soul, and the good work which follows such a transformation are the result, not the cause, of the transformation. The church of the present day has abandoned this faith, seeking by seductive sophistry to short-circuit the path to salvation mandated by God: "good works" are the way to Heaven, announces the false prophet, and the individual need not even bother to perform them himself, we shall let Government do them for us, through its taxing and spending powers! (Never mind that an act of charity or goodwill is virtuous only if done voluntarily.) And so the Social Gospel was born.

No, it is not to be wondered at, in a social order such as that traced above, if many women sense a lack of "fulfillment" in the home. Some have consequently plunged head-long into the world of public affairs, seeking therein a fulfillment which will no more be found by them than it is by men, witness the apalling private lives of the numerous Solons in Washington who have charted the disastrous course of the Great Republic.

True family relation has disintegrated, true communal values have evaporated, and now women must look to the domain of the heathen. Government, moreover, has not been a neutral on-looker to these developments but has, instead, taken active part in championing the forces of social dissolution, by usurping the responsibility that mature son once had for aged parent, by centralizing in the capital city those once-local affairs of community governance, and by establishing the profane altar of secular humanism as official religion.

The justification for the entire host of brazen Federal usufactions is ever the same: "If government does not provide for the People and make decisions for the People, no one will look after them!" One is supposed not to notice, presumably, that the government produces nought and can therefore only take, and that the monies for the alleged government "benefits" are in fact taken from the People's own pockets through taxation. The worst that can be said of a republican truth which has fostered the rise of "liberation" movements, (which, in turn have demanded a further abandonment of these civilizational values), must be traced back to the source from which these symptoms of the ills of the present age issued forth. This source was modernism and feminism, as aptly described more than a century-and-a-half ago by Prince Clemens Metternich, who was forty years Foreign Minister of the Empire of Austria, and the sworn enemy of liberalism in all its manifestations: socialist, communist or bourgeois. In a confidential letter to Tsar Alexander II in 1851 the Austrian statesman described the source of modern social decay: "As a consequence of the advent of mass-circulation newspapers (and other means for Liberal control of 'public opinion'), religion, morality, legislation, economics and administration appear to have become common property accessible to all. Knowledge appears to come by inspiration. Past experience has no value for the presumptuous man, and he substitutes for faith (which means nothing to him) a so-called private conviction, and he reaches this conviction without examination or study.

"For such methods of approach are not too trivial for a mind that deems itself strong enough to take in at a glance all facts and problems. Laws have no significance for the presumptuous man because he had no hand in the making of them and it would be beneath the dignity of a man of his parts to recognize limitations imposed by brutal and ignorant generations of the past. Power resides in himself: why should he submit to a rule based upon outmoded limitations of human nature which applied only to past society devoid of enlightenment and knowledge?"

"The real aim of the 'idealists,' in the final analysis, is thus nothing less than the creation for each individual of an existence entirely independent of any moral authority and any will other than his own. But this is an absurd idea, one contrary to a man's nature, and incompatible with the needs of human society.

"The peace of entire generations, including their own, does not appear to enter into the calculations of those few sincere philanthropic dreamers, and the same is true of their associates, the Calculated Liberals of the bourgeoisie; these latter resemble opportunists who break into a house which they have set on fire, not to save the valuables, but to make off with them."

The words are true today, and clearly apply to the liberation ideology. Traditional social order of thousands of years' duration is dismissed in a moment as a Dark Age molded by "sexist conditioning," although no explanation is proffered as to how some have mysteriously escaped such conditioning so as to be qualified as our Leaders to the New Age of Reason and Light. Centuries of law which recognized that men and women are neither equal nor unequal, but rather, different, are to be jettisoned as just so much excess baggage on the journey to the new world order. The notion that the in-born nature of men and women may be repealed by legislative edict, or thwarted by judicial dictate is, however, currently a failure: the statement of God upon His creation is immutable. One may try to dodge this by an attempt by constitutional amendment to proscribe winter as to declare men and women to be without distinction. One may as well...
emulate Aeolus, King of the Winds, or Lear, commanding the winds to cease their hurricane and the seas to still their rising flood.

The women of the fevered brow have sought to place the engines of government power into the service of their cause, and in this endeavor they have achieved a triumph. Most Federal bureaucracy has arisen to daily prescribe what proportion of women must appear in executive offices, upon university faculties, and in this or that professional school. These directives are simply one more factor in the alterations that are constantly more in operation, to strip the States and their localities of all legal authority and to remove all power from the citizenry to the inaccessible Federal fortress that is Washington, D.C.

Prince Metternich, much like de Tocqueville, recognized the necessity to society of intermediary institutions between the government and the people: Church, guilds, local governing bodies, private corporations, wide family relations; all performed this crucial function in society. Metternich also recognized that liberalism acts as a solvent upon the social order, "dissolving all the ties which bind man to man, man to woman, individual to society, and morality to social order. Liberalism has dissolved all these intermediary structures in the name of "liberation," but since nature is an island and no one can exist in a social vacuum, "liberation" is never and can never be the final result of the dissolution of the old order. And what is the final result? Wrote Metternich, "When this intermediary is destroyed, as one day it shall be, and the isolated individual stands alone against all powerful central authority, there will follow a terrible tete-a-tete, one abounding in cruel surprises."

That confrontation between the powerless individual on the one hand, and all powerful government on the other has arrived, and the cruel surprises are unfolding with evermore frequency. De Tocqueville predicted that modern liberal "democratic" government would become "an immense tutelary Power discharging the lives of the citizenry down to the most minute particular." Can it be questioned that that moment has arrived, despite the Supreme Court's pious verbiage as it creates new "rights" at every opportunity? (Note: that such "rights" inevitably involve the taking of power from the States and transferring their enforcement and the determination of their extent to the Federal power: those "rights" which the Federal power "creates" it may with equal facility abolish.)

The present cultural, social and educational milieu, which blinds a whole nation to the Truth and renders it dependent upon government for every necessity of existence, inevitably fosters the pursuit of false gods: disco, drugs, punk, materialism, modern art, government paternalism and fads of every absurd description; every avenue possible must be explored to escape from an order of things made intolerable because the path to truth has been seemingly foreclosed by the false picture of social order projected through the machinery of "public opinion" operated by the ruling elite. Those who would "liberate" individuals from the evils of the modern age should ponder why they believe that the further destruction of true family, community and religious values will abate these evils when, in fact, it is the decay of such values which gave rise to the evils in the first place. The solution lies in a direction opposite to that charted by liberation ideology. It lies in a restoration of the true principles upon which social order must rest if it is to fulfill the needs of humanity, these being Church, family, community, and individual and local responsibility. The larger part of the population recognizes the direction in which improvement lies, thus their votes in every national election since the depth of the problem became apparent in the latter 1960's. Presidential candidates have been, quadrennially selected who pledged to prevent the Federal power from hindering such a restoration. The restoration of traditional values has not, however, transcended but, instead, the official encouragement of revolutionary values has continued apace. Our Liberal rulers state that this is because a restoration of traditional values is impossible. The writer submits that it is not impossible, but merely contrary to the vested interest of those who promote and profit by every sort of upheaval and social dislocation, and who reap benefit from vast government expenditure and borrowing policy.

There is, after all, nothing new about the "women's movement," despite the prattlings of the liberationists: it may be traced back as far as the ancient Romans. In the 14th century, Chaucer was thoroughly familiar with its failacies. The real reason for its promotion during the past decade has been nothing less than an act of sheer insanity; to brave the home for the factory or assembly line, to help prop-up an economic system collapsing under the weight of monstrous Federal taxation, Federally-created inflation, and ruinous regulation.

Is it not remarkable that those whose shouts are loudest for "liberation" are those who would place supreme power in the hands of the forgers of chains?

By M. Varga-Sinka

I was looking at some of the old alumni photos on the second floor some weeks ago when I thought of calling a few of the ladies who graduated from here when our parents were born. I asked them all virtually the same questions and received virtually the same replies.

The oldest graduate listed in the Alumni office was the Hon. Mary B. Grossman who was a Common Pleas of 1912. Miss Cone, who graduated in 1916, informed me that Judge Grossman had died some years ago. Miss Cone herself is 90 years old and like each of the ladies I spoke with, was very sharp and active. She had no trouble getting into school and picked up a "Winds" jargon." She never practiced but worked as a secretary at what was then a very large law firm by name of Hoyt, Duston, Kelley, McKeehan, Merrick, Arter and Stewart. She never experienced any form of gender discrimination from any of her male colleagues or law professors.

Tabnette Y. Bigelow graduated in 1926. When I began our conversation by informing her that she was one of our oldest graduates, she cut me off quick with a retort: "Do you really think I should brag about it!" She was one of twenty-five women out of a class of 125. "There was no trouble getting in as long as they passed the exam." She "didn't look for prejudice" and as a consequence never found it. There was one law professor by name of Prof. Hyde who was very tough with her but then he was very tough with everyone. She enjoyed her law school education: "... a good time: Drama Club, fancy dancing; dated the men..." I asked her why she attended and she said she "wanted to do something for the men." Her father had insisted that "no daughter of mine is going to be a homemaker for $10 a week. Be a lawyer and make speeches." She did probate work in private practice and worked for more than thirty years with the government as a special counsel for the Defense Contract Administration here in Cleveland. Only once during her tenure did she have a promotion delayed by a Col. who should have known better. She finally did get it because her male colleagues intervened. She had pleasant memories of her school and professional life.

I then called Serena T. Maun, a graduate of 1928. She was in one of the last classes which was able to apply and attend with a High School diploma. No discrimination; all that was required by her was that she could read them. She married and did work as an administrative assistant for Procurement and Construction Contracts. I asked her if there was any "pay discrimination" and she replied: "I was paid more than the men." Why? "I felt I deserved it. I was smarter..." "The "Women’s Movement"? "It gives me a pain... it’s not handled well at all..." Sometimes the conduct of individuals in the law profession make her ashamed of being a lawyer. She finds the media less less culpable for the manner in which it disseminates such information.

J. Helen Slough, class of 1929, is still practicing. Her father was a patent attorney and she took over and practiced privately until 1973 when she went to Squires, Sanders & Dempsey and started their Part Time Practice. In August of 1979, she returned to private practice. Two of the women who have worked with her are Prof. Moody and Dorothy Servis who is now one of the four senior attorneys for U.S. Steel. She has fond memories of her law school which she attended at night while going to college during the day where she earned a bachelor’s degree in Literature. She also took a number of Engineering courses. She is a past president of the National Association of Women Lawyers. She favors the EPA, though she feels too many groups have used it for personal causes which have nothing to do with its original intent.

Continued on page 8
Her mother was a suffragette and the feeling among many women after receiving the vote was a greater degree of self-confidence. She had no trouble getting into school, no discrimination by any of the instructors, no resentment by any of the male students. What discrimination she experienced was from members of her own sex. She feels that women always worked harder and took extra courses. However, there was quite a bit of discrimination by the larger law firms at one time, but for a long period prior to that, and since then, no such difficulty existed. Her personal view has more to do with personal strength of character than with any temporal aid: "If you really want to do it, and are willing to sacrifice, you're bound to land on your feet."

Sr. Nora Thomas attended law school (class of 1929) prior to entering the convent. I asked if she had experienced any discrimination prior to or during law school and she said "None . . . I don't know what that means . . . Maybe there was but I never saw it or experienced it. There were three or four of us out of a class of 100 or so." She practiced before entering the religious life and taught business law at the College of Mt. St. Joseph. She no longer teaches and does legal work for their community. Was there any difference between then and now in what a woman could accomplish? "None. If a woman has the ability to achieve her goal, she ordinarily does achieve it, but if she does not have the ability to achieve the goal she is aiming at, she cannot charge discrimination because of her failure to do so."

Well, what about ERA or the "Women's Movement"? "Women don't really understand it. The second section of the Amendment gives the Federal Government powers now possessed by the states. The states would be giving up more of their rights and could do nothing with respect to laws governing relationships concerning men and women. There have been any number of laws passed by Congress during the last fifteen years which protect women: the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Health-Manpower Training Act of 1964, the Education Amendment of 1972, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, Equal Credit - 1974, Title VII - 1974, Fair Labor Standards, numerous state laws as well as the 14th Amendment: ERA will really benefit men more than women."

Miss Tina G. Buzzey is still practicing and answered a resounding "NO" to any suggestion about discrimination in school from time of application until the last day of attendance. She always felt, even while practicing, that "it was a matter of working twice as hard (in order) to prove yourself" but "that should always be the case: be well prepared." When negotiating a settlement with a larger law firm, there was a tendency on part of the opposing counsel to lower their offer more than would normally be expected. However, "if the opposing counsel saw that you were well-prepared, (you are) treated with respect . . ." She stuck to her guns and prevailed. She was the first woman to be appointed as Asst. Attorney General in Ohio. It was a political appointment by Tom Herbert who was then Ohio's Attorney General. She represented the State in Workmens Compensation Claims which were much different than today: "There were no de novo hearings; they were regular hearings before a referee; civil procedure rules were followed; a court reporter was present; if the claim was disallowed, the claimant took an appeal to the Common Pleas where it was tried on its record." Since 1948 she has been in private practice; "... mostly industrial accidents. Most cases were referred to me by other lawyers most of whom were men. It's a tribute to women in law." If she had to do it over again, she would form a partnership because of the advantages. She finds her practice challenging and gratifying with no time for being bored. The current cases and legislation are a good mental exercise. She asked her opinion on the "Women's Movement" and she stated that she was simply "not into it at all. I do believe that if the duties are the same, the pay should be equal. (I'm) not active in it. I've felt no discrimination as far as representing claimants or as far as practicing law. I would like to see women address themselves to tax reform where there is such a gross injustice to single people. That's the area! More laws put on the books mean nothing unless enforced."

She has fond memories of the school and her career in law: "My first duty is to my clients. Law is an excellent background for anything. It teaches you to think; it imparts the art of analysis."

I also talked briefly with a Mrs. Vivian G. Warner, class of 1930, and received the same replies re "sex discrimination": "... never aware of it. She remembered the teachers as being "very fine professors who were practicing professionals." The officers of the class always had a good representation of men and women. She worked for the City of Cleveland in the Department of Vital Statistics. She found no discrimination in promotion or pay. She was, instead, "rather annoyed by news of discrimination. What do they ("Women's Movement") want? What are they trying to accomplish? We were never subservient!" She belonged to the Bar Association and has been affiliated for twenty-five years with an athletic club. There were several women whom I was unable to contact. They graduated between the years of 1918 and 1923. I have no doubt that they would have been as interesting and gracious as each of these women were.
form letter to textbook publishers as part of an investigation into the "nature and impact of textbook biases." They asked publishers to submit their guidelines which would be studied for evidence of "imposing censorship" and "applying guidelines." You are, of course, still free to decide for yourself.

The "person" for "man" substitutes thumbs down from several authorities such as Oxford English Dictionary which defines the word "man" (as it was also used in the Constitution and other documents) first as "human being, from the Latin, homo (the human race)." Jacques Barzun, editor of Follett's American Usage, concludes that on the "score of history, etymology, and Sprachgefühl, the appellation 'Madame Chairman' is correct and decent," and "chairperson" is not.

St. James knew the importance of words. "If any man offend not in word, the same is perfect man, and able also to judge the whole body. Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us; and we turn about their whole body. Behold also the ship, on which it is a great thing. How much more will the mouth of a sinner be to the man of judgement, that speaketh of his iniquity?"

Words and ideas are the essence of this matter. "Women's Liberation" and their ardent, "emancipated male sympathizers" (a charmed circle of limp-wristed, epicene, Liberal flits with noerooted vocabularies, a collectively crimson consciousness, and the predictable desire to punish the source of their existence: the family) are the contraceptives of the soul.

Roles do not limit men and women but protect them. How many of us will awaken (or have awakened) as Don Quixote finally did from the delusion of believing who he isn't knowing, as he did, one's insignificance? Man, when he discovers his real self, more often than not finds nothing there. Being a loved and honoured husband or wife, breadwinner or mother cushions that fact. What can Liberation do for its liberated clientele who won't even be able to role play?

"Clever of you to try to conceal your intelligence behind the stereotype of looking sexy."

A MISCONCEIVED QUARTER CAN PRODUCE UNUSUAL CHANGE

By Karen Kilbaine

Now that I am a veteran of one quarter at this venerable institution, I can look back at that first quarter with more maturity and laugh at my naive misconceptions. I wasn't too frightened at starting school as I remembered college and it figured it would be the same. I will admit that I began to worry when I bought my books. Heavy books with small print tend to frighten me. When I saw the writing assignment and the reading that was required the day we started, it did put a damper on my enthusiasm. Those first readings seemed particularly complicated but I naturally assumed the kind-hearted professor would explain it all very carefully. After that fateful first day, it became very clear. Every day we had to read and brief and every day it became more complicated.

One peek at my law dictionary should have clued me in. I bought a new Black's Law Dictionary to start off the year. Every word was unfamiliar even after I read the definition. There are a few possible explanations for inventing law dictionaries. Either Black and Ballantine grew up with the philosophy, "If you can't impress them, B.S. them," or the dictionary is another version of 1984's vocabulary of Doublespeak. Probably the most realistic notion is that law dictionaries are a plot by law schools to weed out students afraid of foreign words of more than six letters. After perusing through a few books in the library, it looks as though things won't get better.
Irving Younger’s ideas on trial tactics are mostly a compendium of solid, common-sense principles. But he is not fearful of the unorthodox, and many of his views have raised eyebrows among traditional courtroom practitioners.

For example, Mr. Younger believes that in most cases a criminal defendant should never be seen by the jury. A defense attorney, he says, should try to convince the presiding judge that the defendant’s presence in the courtroom isn’t necessary or, at least, that the defendant should sit in the rear of the courtroom, far from the jurors. Why? Mr. Younger says the vast majority of criminal defendants have an appearance that results in conviction on sight.

"If they try me, they will acquit," he says. "If they see my client, they will convict."

Other of Mr. Younger’s tactical tips seem to plumb the ethical limits of trial practice. Take his notion on how to deal with an opponent’s effective but unobjectionable closing arguments.

If the opposing lawyer is holding the jury spellbound, yell. Younger says, the spell must be broken, at all cost. And he suggests the attorney leap to his or her feet and make furious and spurious objections. They will be overruled, but they might at least break the opposing counsel’s concentration.

The bulk of Mr. Younger’s trial suggestions are basic, tried-and-true formulas. Few trial lawyers are unaware of his “Ten Commandments of Cross-Examination,” an abbreviated list of do’s and don’ts that are taught in many law schools. They are:

* Be brief. A cross-examination that seeks to make three points is good; one that seeks to make only one point is best.
* Ask short questions using plain, understandable words.
* Never ask anything but a leading question.
* Never ask a question to which you don’t already know the answer.
* Listen to the witness’ answer (few lawyers do and suffer as a result, according to Mr. Younger.)
* Don’t quarrel with the witness.
* Never permit the witness to repeat the direct examination.
* Never permit the witness to explain his or her answers.
* Don’t ask one question too many. If you make a telling point, avoid trying to re-emphasize it by asking another question that may backfire.
* Don’t bring out your conclusions in the cross-examination. Save them for closing arguments when the witness is in no position to rebut them.

The Saint Margaret Hungarian School presents the fifth in its series of academic lectures at Cleveland State University jointly with the University’s Ethnic Culture Program on Friday, February 13, at 7:00 p.m. in the Main Classroom Building, Room 105. The title of the presentation is "Bela Bartok: A Retrospective View of His One-Hundredth Birthday Celebration. The guest speaker is Dr. William R. Martin, Professor of Music, Music History Division Head, Cleveland State University.

Dr. William R. Martin has been a professor at Cleveland State University since 1966. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Oxford where he worked under the supervision of the noted musicologist Sir Jack Westrup. His publications include works on sixteenth-century music and music of the twentieth century. Most recently he has contributed an article on the sixteenth-century composer Orazio Vecchi to the New Grove’s Dictionary, and has co-authored a book published by Prentice Hall, Music of the Twentieth Century. Dr. Martin is well-known in the community as a performer both as soloist and as a conductor.

The Saint Margaret Hungarian School cordially invites everyone to attend who seeks a deeper understanding of the Hungarian culture.
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DON'T FORGET YOUR PROFESSOR.
Think of all the dreadful stuff he has to read:
Supreme Court decisions that a schoolboy's lemonade-stand is engaged in Inter-State Commerce; law review articles detailing the constitutional rights of fishes; memos from the A.C.L.U.
He needs a change. He needs a change that will shake him up and lift him from his gloom.
Why not give him the Gavel?
The first number will make him yell, but he will be waiting for the second. And the third will make a new man of him. His lectures will improve.
He will begin to forget the revolution.

Imported and Domestic
Beer - Wine - Pop

OPEN SUNDAY
STORE HOURS
Mon., Tues., Wed., Thurs.
10 am-10:30 pm
Shop Late — Miss Crowd
Fri., Sat.
10 am-1:00 am
Sun.
1:00 pm to 6:00 pm

Buckeye South Woodland Beverage
13108 Buckeye Road Cleveland, Ohio 44120

"YOU SAVE, AND,YOUR WORD ON WORK, FREE SHAKERS, NOW STICK TO IT!"

"TAXPAYER, IF YOU CAN HEAR THIS...CHEER UP... WE'RE WORKING ON YOUR SITUATION."
HAVE YOU MADE A SUMMARY JUDGMENT ABOUT RASCAL HOUSE?

EXAMINE THE FACTS AND CONSIDER OUR APPEAL!

Saloon — features the lowest prices in town and unbeatable daily freebies. Happy Hour EVERY DAY from 2 to 5.

Restaurant — a large variety of really "good" food served without waiting — at prices rivalling all others.

Game Room — featuring the best of your favorite and the newest available machines.

MONDAY — Mon Nite Football and free hot peanuts.
TUESDAY — SURPRISE SPECIAL — a second Happy Hour from 7-9 p.m.
WEDNESDAY — Ladies Day and free hot popcorn.
THURSDAY — SURPRISE SPECIAL — a second Happy Hour from 7-9 p.m.
FRIDAY — Free hot hors d'oeuvres (including sauer kraut balls) during Happy Hour.
SATURDAY — College Football and French Fried Mushrooms at only 25¢ per order.
SUNDAY — we rest our case.

EXHIBIT "A"

Free to Law Student appearing at Rascal House on Official Investigation at the Scene in consideration of Appeal . . .

3 Buttermilk Pancakes and Sausage with hot maple syrup and creamy butter; Coffee, freshly brewed

No strings!
Tender this coupon only!

East 21 & Euclid Ave., across from CSU
Open 7 am to 11 pm, Friday's till 1