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Dear Editors:

As a male student, I find your fixation on women and women's issues to be somewhat amusing, but far from funny. Should I attempt a psychoanalysis of the situation, I might think that you are a bit threatened by the ever-growing presence of women here at Marshall and in the legal profession generally. If this criticism seems unfair or a bit too speculative, let me remind you of the total unfairness of M. Varga-Sinka's remarks on the motivation of leading women activists as being in the realm of "vengeance" having its source in "ill-remembered childhoods or well-remembered miserable marriages." It's always easier to attack the person (and by implication, women who don't think like you do) than to deal with the issues.

Likewise, M. Varga-Sinka's and S. Smith's digressions into the broad issues of politics, religion, and the causes of good and evil everywhere, are also quite imbalanced. One must ask whether the purpose of a law school newspaper is to publish ideological distractions to such an extent. A more balanced format would not hurt. But, of course, why worry about balance when you've got the "Truth?"

Duane Isabella

The editors of the Gavel deemed it desirable to devote an issue of this publication to "women's issues" for the precise reason to which you advert, to wit, "the ever-growing presence of women here at Marshall and in the legal profession generally.

The editors, in pursuit of fairness, requested articles upon these topics from several feminine organizations and professors; none were submitted. This, of course, disposes of your demand for a "more balanced format." (Had you read the conscious notice to this effect upon the first page inside the cover of that issue, you could have spared yourself considerable effort and embarrassment.)

The editors wished to place a serious issue into its proper place in the history of the human condition. Too often, contemporary society elevates into cosmic concerns those issues which, when viewed from a proper perspective, pale into insignificance. Surely, every individual who has pondered the affairs of existence will believe himself entrusted with a certain portion of the Truth. Yet you endeavor to ridicule the very notion that we might attempt to convey in writing our conception of what is True, while reserving to yourself the right to proclaim that your view is correct and ours is false. You have provided yet another example of the centuries-old fallacy of the Left that there are no Absolutes, which of course is the Left's own Absolutes. Your remarks, in effect, say that "It is absolutely true that there are no absolute truths, and if anyone says there are, he lies, and has no right to make the statement."

You state that "it is always easier to attack the person (and, by implication, women who don't think like you), than to deal with the issues."

In view of this remark, we find it worthy of note that your letter contains no refutation of the positions we have taken, in our articles, on the issues. (A reasonably attentive perusal of our little essays would reveal their devotion to the discussion of issues, rather than to personalities. Steve Smith's essay mentions only Prince Metternich, Doctor Johnson, Lear, and Aeneas, King of the Winds: not a single "women's liberator among them to be attacked.""

Meanwhile, however, your letter does "attack the person," as in the statement "you are a bit threatened" and "imbalanced."

Even the most pedestrian acquaintance with history and metaphysics would have informed you that the existence and validity of a philosophical position stand upon their own merits quite apart from the particular eccentricities of the present proponent of said position.

The editors further defend the positions they have taken upon the ground that two thousand years of recorded history, revealed Truth, and logical inquiry establish these positions as being correct. Human experience has confirmed the validity of certain great thinkers, whose thoughts we have merely repeated. It is not simply that we disagree with people "who don't think like (we) do." We did not invent these positions. Kindly read over Prince Metternich's remarks upon the characteristics of the "presumptuous man," in which he notes that the position of opponents of traditional social order is based upon neither historical fact nor logical progression of thought, but is, instead, the product of Phantasy, and a creation of an imagery Age when faeries and demi-gods ruled the earth and waters of Lethe washed-up at the very doorways of progressive political clubs; that is to say, of an Age that never existed. Progressive political thought wishes that men and women were exactly the same; it wishes that Socialism might actually work in practice; it wishes that Wise Leaders may be entrusted with the welfare of the race and that, in the words of M. Varga-Sinka, "the economy and society and every detail of life and then, progressivism posits these wishes as being facts and proceeds to act upon them. When humanity inevitably resists beingshoehorned into this monstrous vision, the Progressive lays down his wishing-book and takes up the machine gun (one need look no further than the Soviet, Chinese and Cuban 'Peoples' Paradises').

The coercive force of law is merely the first weapon in the Progressive arsenal; O.E.O., E.E.O.C., 'guidelines,' regulation, and confiscatory taxation, for example. But the gallows and the guillotine are the inevitably preferred and resorted-to instruments in the Progressive's crusade to remake and reform humanity. For better or worse, would the world be if 'social reformers' comprehended the wisdom of Hawthorne's observation: he who would "reform" society should first undertake to reform himself. You may not yet understand. But, as Doctor Johnson said long ago, "Sir, I have found you an argument; I cannot find you an understanding."

— Steve Smith

(Colored) "My father decided fairly early on that life at home was pretty unbearable; and lived more and more of it at his club, only coming home to sleep. My mother did not protest about this as it gave her an opportunity to tyrannize the children and enlist their aid to disenfranchise my father completely . . . The most sinister aspect of domestic infighting is the use of the children as weaponry and battlefield . . . My mother used to mutter to me that my father was a 'senile old goat' . . . Once my mother knelt on my small brother's chest and beat his face with her fists in front of my father and was threatened with violent retaliation, the only instance of my father's rising to the bait that I can recall. My brother was three years old at the time."
Gun control is a highly topical issue of late, cries for stricter control of firearms following the murder of ex-Beatle John Lennon. More recently, at a local level, the topic again attracted attention by the front page headline story of an Eastlake man who bought a .38 caliber revolver and proceeded to kill his wife, his two sons, call the police, and kill himself within mere hours. The Cleveland nightly paper ran an editorial decrying Ohio's lack of a waiting period of at least a week or ten days before a handgun purchased may be received.

Handguns predominate in the commission of firearm-related crime, comprising for instance, 78 percent of firearm-related murder weapons in the U.S. in 1978. Overall, handguns accounted for 9,582 of an estimated 19,555 murders in that year. Although FBI Uniform Crime Reports do not differentiate handguns from the general category firearms used in robberies and aggravated assaults, the only other two of seven index crimes for which weapons usage is reported, handguns are easily involved in over two hundred thousand of these crimes annually. The price is indeed high in what Chief Justice Burger identifies as "billions of dollars and thousands of blighted lives." Recognition of the handgun as the firearm of choice for criminal abuse was made by a recently released federal advisory panel report which urged restrictive legislation.

Aside from the clear fact that handguns are implicated as seriously abused weapons in this country, little is known of the extent of the pool of handguns in the nation or the dynamics of the flow of handguns into criminal hands. An interesting theory of a Detroit-based forensic psychiatrist asserts that "firearm deaths are the mathematical function of the number of firearms in circulation." Accepting this deduction is plausible, it is the unrestricted flow of handguns into the nationwide market that may be sustaining the problem, because the handguns used in crime tend to be of relatively recent manufacture. Collectors and sportsmen usually have to wait months or years to get high quality guns and when they take possession tend to remain in possession thereof.

The reason that handguns are so frequently abused relates to three fundamental design characteristics. Handguns are portable, concealable, and capable in most instances of being fired by the use of a single hand. The argument that they are not "malicious" is as ludicrous as would be the argument that "cigarettes don't cause cancer, people cause cancer." The axiom that all guns are loaded is simply a deserved recognition of the tremendous destructive potential inherently residing in these objects, inanimate though they may be.

There are two basic obstacles which operate and interact to hinder the development of fair and effective handgun legislation. The first is a large very vocal political resistance to any regulation whatsoever on any type of firearm, unfettered purchase, receipt, possession, and ownership of which is argued to be a right constitutionally protected against "infringement."

The second is the firearm industry which has continued to feed handguns to the market in great number and at great profit to itself while failing even to establish internally consistent industrywide standards of serialization.

Opposition to handgun legislation is founded upon a fundamental conservatism stemming from the traditional fear among Americans that tyranny lurks within and without the structure of our government and extending in modern times to the fear of crime. It may be said of the conservatism that it is not inconsistent, that it traces its path back through the revolution that led to the formation of this nation. As Trotsky perceptively observed, revolution derives "not from infallibility and mobility of reason's mind but just the opposite, from its deep conservatism." Thus, we have the Second Amendment which reads "A well-regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

With respect to the Second Amendment, the first two sections, set off by commas, represent what in the area of wills are known as words of induction rather than words of limitation. As such they modify the "people" whose right shall not be infringed. For example, prisoners retain those constitutional rights which are not inconsistent with their status as prisoners, the right to keep and bear arms not being among them. The same applies to felons, alcoholics, mental incompetents, junkies, and other undesirables who are ineligible to purchase, own, or possess firearms of any sort. The Second Amendment presupposes faith in government of, by, and for the people and may not be construed as requiring the federal government nor its component parts to abrogate their duty to promote the public health, morals, safety, and general welfare.

It has been argued that the most important question to be considered in any proposed regulation of firearms is whether it will effectively establish guidelines permitting discrete identification of criminal violators and create criminal accountability for its violation susceptible of diligent prosecution.

The permeability of state and local borders in America indicates the necessity for the federal government to establish a legislative solution to the priming of crimes with handguns. The earmarks of the solution must be uniformity and centralization which are the strong points of federalism. This is not to disparage the virtue of state and local attempts to alleviate the problem. Ohio really should have dealer requirements, owner requirements, purchase requirements other than the mere filling out of the appropriate federal forms, and a waiting period. Local legislation, which suffers the flaw of being unable to provide due process notice to non-residents, can be effective if diligently enforced only because it has a smaller area to cope with.

Whatever federal solutions may arise, it is incumbent upon pragmatism in the light of political reality that it is an improved conceptual approach compared with the current federal law. Forms expecting to elicit admissions of ineligibility or criminal intent obviously do not work. Moreover, increasing penalties for the use of handguns in crime will not alone suffice. Clearance rates for firearm-related crimes are a fraction of the number committed. Further, not only is the efficacy of attempts at deterrence dubious, such approaches are necessarily after-the-fact. To pass muster, to survive the gauntlet of political opposition, new federal legislation must be devoid of apparent infringement and discriminating between law-abiding responsible gun owners and ineligible undesirables.

The ultimate solution may involve a quantum leap to surpass the obstacles in its path, which include administrative expense and avoidance of accumulating bureaucratic burdens. But the solution may also be found through simplification. No law-abiding citizen need be deprived of ownership of a firearm, if requirements might be imposed on purchasers, dealers, and manufacturers. In Argentina, transactions in so-called weapons of war are forbidden except to specified institutions, groups, and individuals. Thus, membership in good standing in a qualified government independent rifle association could be required in our country and this would be entirely consistent with the Second Amendment specification of a "well-regulated militia." To maintain its qualification, the percentage of association members perpetrating crimes would have to remain below a given percentage.

There is no excuse for the failure of the federal government, or the firearms industry of its own volition, to promulgate meaningful uniform industrywide standards for the serialization of firearms. From looking at the serial number the manufacturer, state of sale, and date of manufacture should be readily apparent. The original purchaser should be identifiable, along with the dealer of record, by required engravings of dealer numbers and verified purchaser social security numbers or drivers license numbers. There should be restrictions on subsequent sale, transfer, or disposition. It is at least conceivable that a computer bank containing the social security numbers of ineligible undesirables could be established and made accessible via phone links. Reference to said system by dealers could be made mandatory. All these approaches arguably avoid the alleged infringement of actual licensing and registration.
How we hated him — the pompous ass! From the hair turning distinguished grey, to that red bulbous nose that had been engaged in God-knows-what sordid activities, to the wire rim glasses all the law professors wore, to the designer suits, he reeked of superiority! And he let us know how inferior we were every chance he got, from passing comment to outright rebuke.

Not all of us had even quieted down, when Blowhard settled in his chair, swung his feet on his desk, and announced, "This is a case for another sheep to be slaughtered. I groaned inwardly when I heard him say, "Mr. Bartleby, will you tell us about the Van Brocklin case." Bartleby hadn’t spoken all quarter! The reply had said in a soft, firm voice, "I’d prefer not to," a remark which had been lost on half of the room, but Blowhard’s reaction wasn’t. His ears pricked, his eyes flashed, he got up from the chair and moved out by his desk. He leered at Bartleby (that godawful intimidating leer) and demanded, "What did you say?"

"I’d prefer not to," Bartleby repeated his earlier remark, which we all heard that time.

Blowhard’s face seemed to turn all the colors of the rainbow, his ears seemed to be smoking, his eyes appeared horror-stricken. A second away from disaster, he turned away to regain his composure. He found Bartleby, and said with a great deal of self-control, "Mr. Bartleby, that is not an acceptable answer in this class.

You can say that you have not read the case, in which you get a ‘0.’ You can pass and get the same grade, or you can deliver the case. Now will you do the Van Brocklin case?"

I can still see Bartleby looking him in the face and saying yet again in that soft, controlled voice, "I’d prefer not to." Blowhard looked as though someone had slapped him in the face. He drew himself up to his full height and turned on Bartleby. Trembling with rage, he somehow managed to contain himself. "Mr. Bartleby, I run my class in a certain fashion and I expect my students, while in my classroom to live by my rules. Since you apparently can’t do so, I suggest you get out right now!" With that he gestured to the door.

All the time, Bartleby just sat there, not saying anything. He had not moved when Blowhard glared at him. "Well?"

"I’d prefer not to!"

With that, something in Blowhard snapped, he lost the last vestige of self-control and lunged for Bartleby. All he caught was empty air, because Bartleby revealed an agility few knew he had. Blowhard was dragged back, muttering "I’ll kill him." He was still trying to get Bartleby when the men in the white coats came.

What had changed a normal, "well-adjusted" law professor into a raving lunatic? Was it Bartleby’s demeanor or that totally unexpected response or a combination of the two? I guess we’ll never know since neither of the participants are available. Blowhard is still at Sunnyvale Nursing Home and as for Bartleby, his story has a bizarre ending.

It appears that Bartleby took the course midterm given by Blowhard’s replacement on the staff. Late one afternoon, Bartleby sat at his place, staring at the blackboard. When asked to leave, he replied, "I’d prefer not to." They had to bodily remove him from the law school upon closing down for vacation. I heard that they left him outside the door, with the snow swirling about him. It was the last that was ever heard of Bartleby. Every time the snow flies I think of him again.

Peace in Our Time

By Michael G. Karnavas

In the wake of the Polish dilemma, the U.S. sought to assert its support for Polish territorial integrity by warning the Soviets that a repeat of the 1968 Czechoslovakian invasion in Poland would be contrary to the Helsinki Agreement. The State Department in its infinite wisdom further delineated its position by voicierously stating that an invasion in Poland would force the U.S. to nullify the Helsinki Agreement.

The Polish Unions have become a threat to Soviet hegemony. Dissension within the block cannot be tolerated by the Soviet Union. The Eastern socialist commonwealth is a validation of "socialist internationalism." Furthermore, the Soviets are well aware of the "domino theory;" the loss of Poland may encourage further dissension and inevitably transform Soviet-World communism to merely parochial communism.

It has become obvious that the U.S. has yet to recognize that Detente is a delusion. As the Soviets were mobilizing the Warsaw Pact forces around the Polish borders, the U.S. chose to repeat post World War II diplomacy; a flamboyant policy of rhetorical gymnastics. The Carter administration drunk from its policies of human rights and detente, has repeated the naive diplomacy of John Foster Dulles. While the Soviets were formulating the Eastern Block, Dulles, in 1952, exuberantly urged a policy of empty slogans such as: "liberation," "roll-back," "peaceful engagement" and "bridge-building." These empty slogans were the backbone of U.S. foreign policy in Eastern Europe known as "containment." Containment ultimately proved to be a mere chimera as the Soviet tanks paraded in 1953 at the East Berlin riots, 1956 in Poland and Hungary and 1968 in Czechoslovakia. Finally, the coup de grace to the U.S. diplomatic navetse was the "Brezhnev Doctrine."

Continued on page 11
"PAPA DOC AS COLLEGE PREP: FROM B.D. TO E.M.C."

By The Masked Marvel, Mystery Editor

In September of 1966, a confused collection of fifteen-year-olds sat down in the first class of the first day of their first year of senior high school.

At the front of the room stood a tall, business-like gentleman of early middle-age in a dark suit. "Good afternoon," he said. "There will be no text in this course; you will write your own, in the form of notes upon the lectures which I will deliver."

The gentleman at once began to trace the early struggle of the Dutch to colonize Southern Africa, and to outline an existence in that new land. He swept over topography, climate, natural resources, and the history and character of the colonists.

Day after day, the avalanche of material continued to thunder-forth in the "World Affairs" course, in broad historical outline, and in agonizingly minute detail. "The natives of South Africa brew a mild beverage from corn known as 'Kaffir-beer,'" and "Any person is subject to arrest and detention for a maximum of 180 days without hearing." Crops, rivers, mean annual temperature, the underlying causes of the Boer War; were launched forth in an endless maze of detail. It was the task of the student to understand the relation of the details to each other, and to gauge their effect upon the major points; to separate the important from the superfluous; and to be graded accordingly when examination time arrived. "So this is high school," muttered some.

High school, graduation, college, the anti-war movement, frats, parties, grad school, and the years they fill, fly by.

It is early one morning in an ultra-modern and ultra-un-beautiful structure at Euclid Avenue and 18th Street in Cleveland, Ohio. A business-like gentleman of early middle-age, with a mild Southern inflection, stands at the front of the room in Law Building Room 212. Amidst the modern "functional" furniture and the garish architecture, he enters into a discussion of the ancient English case of Pienaar v. Post, property discovered and layed before the bewildered students' bleary, early-morning eyes: De Donis Conditionalibus; Quia Emptores; of Uses; and of Frauds. Pens and pencils race across lined paper in a frantic effort to keep pace with the observations and insights flowing from the businesslike gentleman at the head of the class. Some were heard to mutter, "So this is law school!"

Others understand what it all was meant to convey. They learned, from Professor Curry's citations to musty old legal reports, that the Law is a time-worn, but respected -- and respectable -- fabric which contains distant generations to the present, reflecting timeless insights into human nature, and setting-forth rules which attempt to reconcile human frailty with the commands of moral principle.

Some say Professor Curry is "uninspiring," others that he is "boring." He is neither. Some say that Professor Curry dwells overmuch on insignificant detail, and ancient, irrelevant cases from pre-Elizabethan ages. He does not.

The Professor presents a calm, but interested history of the law, and of the considerations which have made it what it is today. One cannot understand the rules of law without an understanding of the factors of human nature, and human experience, which caused it to develop in the manner which it did.

Perhaps the reason some individuals find fault with some professors, is that the fault lies not in the professor, but in themselves, and in their past education.

A World Affairs course that seemed unbelievably difficult; sweeping from the failures of Socialism in Cuba, China and Soviet Russia, to the details of "Papa Doc" Duvalier's Tonton Macouti bogeymen in Haiti; somehow became "easier" as the year drew on. Perhaps it only seemed easier, as the teacher helped students to develop abilities to analyze the importance of details, to see the relationship between cause and effect: in short, to think.

Law schools haven't the time or the luxury to teach the elemental skills of reasoning and analysis. Any creditable law professor will recognize that, and devote his energies to just that task. Professor Curry indeed devotes his energies, and considerable knowledge, to that end. (He is also to be commended for his thoughtful and painstaking efforts to provide thorough citations to Ohio law: a gift which too few professors at this establishment bestow on their students.)

The task of preparing students for higher education, indeed for any pursuit in the world, falls to elementary and secondary-school teachers, such as the businesslike gentleman first encountered in the fall of 1966. He didn't have to be a teacher; he owned considerable other property interests, he had the credentials to be professor at a college; he might have remained in government service. Fortunately for some, he chose to teach, and teaches still.

Most fortunate graduate students can look back to one such demanding, and yet enjoyable instructor - - - if they were so fortunate as to have one. They ought to remember to thank such people. A thank-you to Mr. B.D. Douglas of Mentor High. (And thank-you, Professor Curry for your knowledge of property, trusts and future interest.)

(The Editors welcome portraits of past pedagogues who have helped students in the study of law, or in preparing for that study. The editors also wish to emphasize that the Masked Marvel Mystery Editor did not write this article because of any desire to "Curry" favor with a particular professor. The Masked Marvel has taken all of the courses taught by this Prof., and so has no interest (vested or contingent) in securing the professor's good will. In short, the writer's interest is too remote, and is barred by a sort of Rule Against Perpetuities.)

INTERNSHIPS IN D.C.

By Chuck Fonda

Want to try doing something different with your summer? Instead of spending another summer in the Cleveland area, clerking for peanuts, you may be able to spend your summer as a legal intern in the Washington, D.C. area. Many federal agencies and some private firms in the D.C. area take legal interns for the summer. These are law students from around the country who have completed their first or second years.

The benefits are many. In addition to earning much more in Washington during a summer than can be earned here, there is so much more to do and see in Washington. From hiking in the Blue Ridge Mountains, to visiting Mount Vernon, to watching a concert at the Kennedy Center, to visiting the White House, the possibilities are endless. A whole weekend can go by on a visit to the Smithsonian alone. Finally, the contacts made during a summer stay may provide the necessary advantage in that great employment hunt.

Most agencies will now be accepting applications for the summer intern positions, so it's a good idea to get your application ready now. Despite the hiring freeze, it is still a good bet that these positions will be staffed. After all, a hiring freeze was in effect last year, too. There may be room for someone from Cleveland-Marshall this year. For those that are interested, the placement office should have a listing of agencies that are hiring for the summer.
BAR—

By Richard A. Lukich

This year’s Bar-Media Forum Luncheon was a discussion of the conflict between freedom of the press and the right to a fair trial. Such an issue should have made for an interesting debate. However, the panel, which consisted of two members from each the local bar and the media, managed to make this affair much less than interesting.

Opening statements by each of the panelists consisted mainly of accusations and anecdotes. Carl Stokes, by far the most appealing of the participants, was unfortunately relegated to the role of moderation, which afforded him little opportunity to speak after his introductory comments. Mr. Stokes’ insight into this conflict, gained through his work in both professions, was made apparent by his remarks and was far more informative than anything said by the panel members.

Indicative of the lack of originality at this Forum was the agreement by the four panelists that additional communication between members of the media and bar was necessary. Hardly a provocative statement, especially when coupled with the fact that no suggestions for obtaining this goal was forthcoming.

How unfortunate that this discussion was not more informative or productive.

MEDIA

By J. J. Jerse

From the glass booth above the Moot Court I could see that a few fellow students were in attendance, but that most of the audience below consisted of gentlemen in suit and tie. As a cassette deck reeled smoothly away, four of the small red peak lights on the Altec sound mixer to my left flickered intermittently indicating that the microphones of the four panelists were picking up laughter and polite applause. A fifth light on the mixer panel glowed constantly as former Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes spoke in his role as moderator.

The topic of discussion on the day was media and the law. The ensuing exchange of divergent viewpoints revealed more than a little animosity between some of the participants which was undoubtedly softened by the cordial post-luncheon atmosphere. More importantly perhaps, there emerged the adverse tensions of a symbiotic relationship between two fields which have often reviled one another.

From the Bar, defense attorney Gerry Gold recounted with distaste the time he told a television reporter that he could do without his microphone in the mistaken belief that it wouldn’t be shown (in edited form). In response Cleveland Press Editor Herb Kamm, removing his coat in mock challenge upon approaching the podium, admitted the imperfection of his profession while noting that the media had gone far in creating Gold and others of his ilk.
If, for example, the worthy Cleveland Playhouse is to survive, let the patrons and townpeople decide. We should not have to pay bureaucrats in Washington to decide for us. In any event, less money reaches the Playhouse under the present arrangement due to the subtraction of overhead for paying bureaucrats to distribute Cleveland money back to Cleveland institutions.

Returning to the prospective cutback of funds for student loans, Eckart’s maulershading was publicly joined by the blustering of CSU’s financial aid director, William Bennett. He explained that, “Professional graduate schools would suffer because these students also depend heavily upon loans.” The collective roar of multitudinous belly-laugh has yet to die down.

I see a better reality. There are some students who would need loans to get through Cleveland-Marshall, although they could take a year or two longer and work their way through. However, in the evening program there many students who receive $5000 a year in loans even though their salary is over $20,000 a year and they are fully reimbursed for school by their employer. What’s that? Could there be a waste?

I know of only three people who have obtained student loans through Cleveland-Marshall. One is a female who is married to a professional and is a full-time student. She felt at one time position at a local medical institution in order to attend the day program. Her case I would consider marginal.

Another is a male professor who works for a leading Cleveland financial institution which reimburses him for his schooling. He took his $5000 loan and bought a new foreign car. Recently, he was proselytizing a female student to this scam. Her husband is a well-off professional, and yet, she indicated her intent to apply.

A third person is a professional and works for an Akron-based firm which also reimburses employees for schooling. Not needing the loan proceeds, he parked it in a money market fund where it earns him over 15 percent interest.

Would these people drop out of law school if they did not receive the loans? When asked this question all three answered no. Query Messers. Eckart and Bennett, “What is all the shouting about?” It is obvious that the student loans are not only not needed, but they are not needed without affecting the truly needy. The benefit would be lower taxes for the already overburdened producers of this society.

Within the past month another area representative, Mr. Louis Stokes, inadvertently showed some light on a subject of interest. I am not nice enough to mention in public, “If you attack the minimum wage or affirmative action you can be called a racist, but not if a black man says it.”

Ignoring the double standard, that statement can be taken several ways. However, given Stokes’s intimacy with such logic over the past years, if the acid precision of racism is ever near Mr. Stokes, he should first check his own moral baggage.

Stark logic reveals that the minimum wage raises unemployment. By setting a floor under wages, the supply for labor is artificially increased; in other words, more people would be forced to compete for fewer jobs. The demand for labor decreased.

Therefore, more people would be forced to work for less money, and the longer they work the less they are paid. In other words, we have a new definition of productivity. The question is who is going to pay for these changes in the labor market. The answer is those who have been reduced to the status of the worthy.

One need only ask this question. Is society better off with four teenagers earning $2.50 an hour or three teenagers earning $3.35 an hour with the fourth never experiencing work and becoming a burden? The answer is patently obvious.

Even though Representative Stokes has spent his career fighting against measures which would, as it turns out, help minorities, blacks are awakening to the great sting applied to blacks by the black bank of America.

In the past 18 months the economic section of the NAACP announced their opposition to the Georgian Goobers price controls on energy. They realized and argued eloquently that blacks cannot afford to be members of a limited resource, no-growth society.

And so it comes. The conclusion means that the current wealth structure is maintained. Only forcible redistribution, which spawns hatred and malice, can improve the lot of minorities under this scheme. In short, a zero-sum game exists.

An expanding economic pie abolishes the status-quo and presents minorities with real opportunity and wealth without retribution. No one’s wealth or opportunity is injured in the process of growth.

An expanding economic pie is just what the Mountebank Metzenbaum has been fighting against. He is trying to keep the supply of energy and therefore lower economic growth. The government, as Eckart stated, is going to the people and take his mountebank toward the people. But not if a Mountebank Metzenbaum takes it.

Recently, Messers. Eckart and Bennett, one of the people who chose not to attend the day program. Her case would be discredited theories, and a nonprobing effort to attend the day program.

The government, as Eckart stated, is going to the people and take his mountebank toward the people. But not if a Mountebank Metzenbaum takes it.

Recently, Messers. Eckart and Bennett, one of the people who chose not to attend the day program. Her case would be discredited theories, and a nonprobing effort to attend the day program.

One more example of the trouble with the current economic system is the lack of concern over the crushing tax burden.

Lack of concern over the crushing tax burden does not totally characterize Eckart’s true feelings. Looking at his analysis of the programs Reagan want to cut, one prevents a question.

Why should lower income people be forced to subsidize air travel and airports which are mostly used by the upper classes and business travelers? Why should people in the economically depressed areas of Newark, Youngstown, and Detroit be forced to subsidize mass transit in Cuyahoga County?

Why should individuals, who chose not to attend college, be forced to contribute to the education of children from middle and upper class families?

The answer to these questions is found in the overall theme of Eckart’s examples. He wants to keep the power in Washington and away from the citizens.

The government, as Eckart illustrates, subsidizes air travel, mass transit, highways, railroad service, and maritime travel. Why does every form of transportation need a subsidy? Perhaps because each mode is at a disadvantage due to the subsidies of its competitors?

No, it is because subsidies enable the federal government to control each mode of transportation. These programs are the playthings or toys whose loss prompts his place of balance.

Representative Eckart clearly understands that the reasons for President Reagan’s actions are not just to balance the budget, cut inflation, and lower unemployment. A major reason is to return freedom, power, and decisionmaking authority to the common citizen.
DIVORCE COURT

By John Keys
(First in a series)

Ohio's County Courts of Common Pleas, and in the largest counties the Domestic Relations divisions of those courts, have the unenviable task of administering justice in the unhappy areas of divorce, dissolution, annulment, juvenile offenses, and the related situations of custody and adoption.

For the various litigants, these courts can properly be termed "the courts of misery." Even where a party is awarded a favorable judgment there is a strong likelihood that this party will be back in court later on a similar issue, or even the very same issue. Acts by the parties will quite often bring new motions which seek a clarification, a furtherance of rights, or even an attempt to lessen or eliminate the legal rights of the other parent. Where children are involved a divorce is rarely, if ever, final. Property is routinely divided, though sometimes with difficulty. But a person cannot be cut into halves, so the court will award children to one parent or the other. This is so, even where parents are both earnestly willing and able to contribute in the care and control of their children.

Under the Ohio Revised Code, Chapter 3109, the courts are directed to award custody of a child or children to one parent or the other, but not both, or, if in the court's opinion both parents are unfit to continue in the care and control, then to a third party or parties.

It is true that in some Ohio counties a judge will favorably entertain a motion for joint or shared custody. If the parents present a written plan to the court requesting joint custody, they might get what they seek, depending on who is sitting on the bench. Currently there is no language in Ohio law authorizing such an order and only the most liberal and reasonable judges will consider granting such an award.

While custody of children is predicated on "the best interests of the child," and the very latest psychological data (California) emphatically argues that it is almost never in a child's best interest to be raised by only one of the parents, this is nearly always the case. Ohio is clearly in the majority of states which authorize custody to a parent, or to a third party, but not to both parents. Although the trend is swinging toward authorization of shared care and control of children (19 states have adopted statutory language), it is being done with great caution.

It is true that a non-custodial parent has "visiting" rights which in some cases nearly amount to shared custody and control, but this is rare. There are thousands and possibly millions of cases where the end of marriage or joint parenthood at common law is only the beginning of a state of unreasonableness, vindictiveness, such as possessiveness, and hatred between the parents or at least on the part of one parent. Considerably less are the cases where both parents continue to exhibit reason, maturity, compromise and cooperation in the best interests of all concerned, most notably their children. While the former situation, which is more prevalent, is conducive to adversarial positions which are often followed by continued litigation by the parties, this is a no-win situation for the parents, and certainly for the innocent child or children. While the for the innocent child or children. Such situations also breed regular, if not bountiful, legal fees, and it is possibly only the respective counselors who are the only "winners" in the court of misery. Unfortunately, it must be noted that some attorneys promote notions to shared custody and control, but the adversarial position of the parties to the detriment of the children and their clients. This is done even at times when parents are of a conciliatory mood. Though they are a distinct minority, in most situations neither they nor their respective attorneys appear to further their own interests, which can be of no comfort to parents seeking competent legal advice at a time when resentments might explode into full-blown hostilities.

The origin of misery, hostility and in most cases, injustice, are the parents themselves. If they were to continue in a harmonious marital situation neither they nor their children would emerge as losers following an experience in the family court. Yet consider the plight of the parent who has done everything in his or her power to promote peace and harmony at home, and the proper environment for the raising of children, and still becomes a party to a divorce action. In too many cases one parent, rather than both, can be seen as the disruptive force in the breakup of the family, and this from the most objective point of view.

After things go sour on the homefront, there is little solace for any child whose parents are about to terminate a marriage. In Ohio, divorce effectively removes one of the parents from the care and control of the child or children. If Ohio law was geared to the 1980's, there might be cause for hope. But at present there is not. Despite the fact that it is the policy of the State of Ohio to encourage marital harmony, and following divorce it is the policy of the State to foster the "best interests of the children," under the law the Domestic Relations judges are not authorized to permit both parents to continue in the care and custody of their children. If Ohio were a progressive state, it is not the Legislature which created the current system and put in its place one that, to the extent possible, forces separated parents to practice reason, maturity, compromise and harmony, in the best interests of the child.

In reality ORC Title 31 is an antiquity, and is severely limited in promoting the best interests of any member of a broken home. The authors of the code, in a former day, found it appropriate to give the courts considerable discriminatory powers in the area of custody awards, while at the same time limiting those awards to a single parent. They probably could not envision the marriage/divorce rate of 1979 (2-1), the feminist movement which calls for greater freedom for women saddled with domestic roles, the percentage of working mothers, the new multi-generational family, the need for greater 'freedom for women saddled with disciplinary powers in the area of custody awards, and the percentage of divorced mothers (over age, the percentage of divorced mothers, and the cases of the State to

The next article in this series will focus on Mary Boyle's (D-Cleveland Heights) Joint Custody Bill and Helen Fix's (Cincinnati) version of the Uniform Parentage Act, both of which are pending in the state House of Representatives.
The cable closed with the warning that "Given the Persian negotiator’s cultural and psychological limitations, he is going to resist the very concept of a rational (from the Western point of view) negotiating process."

With this insight, we can now appreciate the frustration of the U.S. negotiators, and why the agreement is a work of sheer tenacity and brilliance.

According to Art. 52 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a treaty is void if... procured by the threat or use of force in violation of the principles of International Law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Was the hostage agreement negotiated and signed under duress? The answer is obvious; no. One need only look at the agreement to realize that by its terms the U.S. has given up absolute nothing. However, before addressing this issue, it is essential to categorically state that for all practical purposes, International Law does not apply in this situation. Iran expressly and impliedly renunciation of International Law and order. It would be pure popp-cock for Iran to invoke the protections afforded by International Law, when in fact, Iran has totally disregarded the decision reached by the International Court of Justice to release the hostages. The embassy takeover as well as the inhumane treatment of the hostages was a violation of International Law. Some legal scholars may argue otherwise, but the fact remains that Iran, for 444 days paid lip service to International Law. Iranian mentality exemplifies the doctrine of redundo ad absurdum. This can be further demonstrated through an example given by L. Bruce Laingen in his August 13, 1979 cable where he states: 

...the Iranian central bank sees no inconsistency in claiming force majeure to avoid penalties for late payment of interest due on outstanding loans while the government of which it is a part is denying the validity of the very ground upon which the claim is made when confronted by similar claims from foreign firms forced to cease operation during the Iranian revolution.

The U.S. could take the position that the agreement need not be honored since Iran has failed to recognize International Law, the International Court of Justice, and all of the U.N. resolutions on the release of the hostages. But, being a nation of laws and not men, the U.S. should honor the agreement and not follow the vacillating footsteps of Iran.

Without going into the complexities of the agreement, we must first dispense with the notion that we (Carter administration) signed the agreement under duress. No doubt we negotiated with a handicap, however, the agreement was reached while protecting the U.S.’s honor and interests. The agreement reached basically holds that: First, an apology was never made to the Iranian government. Second, the U.S. paid no ransom. The $2.9 billion to Iran was from the $12 billion in frozen Iranian assets. About $3.7 billion was used to pay off American and other bank loans. About $1.4 billion was left in escrow until disputed claims are settled. This escrow account will be replenished if need be and at all times will be kept at a level of at least $500 million to handle claims. Third, the U.S. will at no time intervene in the Iran-Iraqi war, i.e., the U.S. will not supply the Iranian government with any military equipment. Fourth, more than $3 billion in American claims will be submitted to an international claims commission. All claims to be paid off from the escrow account. Finally, neither the Shah or his wealth was returned to Iran as has been demanded from the outset of the negotiations.

This hostage agreement is in fact a "deal." The U.S. gave up absolutely nothing for the return of the hostages. Of course, the U.S. Embassy should have never been taken over; but, as it was pointed out earlier, the Iranians (based on their cultural and psychological limitations), had ample reason to react in the manner in which they did.

If we are to punish Iran, let us do so through economic sanctions, and not by dishonoring the agreement. However, let us not forget that interdependence has forced this nation to depend on Middle Eastern oil, and that geo/realpolitik dictates that Iran be kept free from the scarlet menace — the U.S.S.R.

Footnote — the hostages did not leave Iranian air space until 30 minutes after Reagan had become president. Therefore, by de facto, Reagan has assented to the agreement.
**MISSING: MILK & TOLLHOUSE COOKIES**

By M. Varga-Sinka

How could I resist? Saturday, February 7, C-M, 1 p.m. part of Cleveland’s woodwork was liberated for an afternoon. A handpainted cardboard sign declared “Cold War, Again.” Separate workshops (for us workers) to discuss “Rights of Women,” “Corporate Moves Against Labor,” “Political Repression,” and several other areas of “concern.”

One approached the Moot Court room to find four “literature” tables stacked with all the hysteria of the Fascist Left. Two revolving members of the Spartacus Youth League were hawking (doving?) copies of their ever-popular fishwrap. There were some very pleased expressions in the crowd among the furrows of “concern.” I couldn’t understand why they were so happy — maybe the Pope had died. One of the coordinators of this voluntary political indoctrination had moved about during the affair looking like a Mennonite who couldn’t find his buggywhip. Every age and income seemed to be represented by the 130 or so participants. Need I say many of them represented the various forms of political insanity disguised under sweet-sounding cloaks such as: “Women Speak Out for Peach and Justice,” “New American Movement,” and “Central American Solidarity Committee.” They’re into bondage and discipline... politically speaking.

In the “workshops,” they unmasked themselves while raising our collective consciousness. The “Political Repression” sweatshop required a sense of the absurd. An attorney, a member of the commie-bulwark National Lawyers Guild, spewed the usual nonsense about how “this capitalist system oppressed political dissent... blah blah blah.” He didn’t appreciate the irony of his statement; a hard thing to do when you take yourself seriously. Besides, (code word) COINTELPRO!!! Teeth gnashed in agreement.

There were no arguments. And then came “worker participation”: a revolving member of the Revolutionary Workers Party ventilated for five minutes what can only be described as a Cleveland Heights translation of Mao-Thought. The Guilderburger made a face about how we weren’t there to discuss ideologies. At this point, the Revolutionary Worker’s archenemy, a revolving member of the Communist Workers Party, piped up to mutter some Trotskyite trash that no self-respecting Trotskyite would mutter. This seemed to annoy the creep from the R.W.P. while the representative from the Socialist Workers Party was unmoved by both of the aforementioned. I was hoping for a brandishing of ideological swords but the Guilderburger interposed himself and we then listened to some “neo-African” activist who was wearing what looked like a Shriner hat without the rhinestone decorations. I knew (don’t ask me how) that he was not really a Shriner. He spoke without an African accent about the “systematic repression” of his “political activities” — i.e., passing literature on a corner of Public Square or sitting in the park and maybe cutting a throat later that night but nothing which requires “police state tactics” such as they and their “brothers” have suffered. COINTELPRO existed “to neutralize militants and everyone else for social, economic and political justice.” Besides, we are “voting ourselves into Fascism”.

It wasn’t entirely on this level. There was a cute little Italian immigrant (with an accent) who sat rather smugly through the entire thing, smoking Camels, and near the end threw in her two cents about how “capitalist-repression” can be found in her homeland: some “workers” at a Fiat factory were fired simply because of their “paleoteeal actevetees.”

The “dialogue” also had what I was really looking for: a self-described “typical, educated, Middle-class American housewife.” She said two things which made my attendance worthwhile. (1) In response to the revolving members of the various communist and communist-front organizations, she said that their lingo was incomprehensible to anyone outside of such organizations, to wit: “When you mention ‘imperialism,’ most people think of margarine.” I liked that. (2) A sentence or two later came a small snake of truth slithering out: “We have to inform them (those of us who think about margarine instead of the latest corporate-fascist diminutions of our freedom) with examples that they can identify with... The idea is to instigate fear.”

Precisely! There in one simple clause is the essence of the Fascist Left and their cousins and all the extant variations. There were no objections to this remark because that is the purpose of gathering like this, the Klan, White Power freaks and other fringe groups which I am sure (what with C-M’s egalitarian attitude towards the dregs of society) will someday honour us with their presence. Not by my invitation, certainly.

Only fools and Liberals assume that such an assemblage of honourable men and women coagulate in order to promote peace, justice, equality and the American Way. With a little effort, with a little sense of humanity they could apprehend truths which are neither relative nor superficial but go to the heart of the matter: “We want to abolish classes, and in this respect we stand for equality. But the claim that this would make all men equal to one another is an empty phrase and a stupid invention of intellectuals.” Lenin’s speech: On Deceiving the People with Slogans about Liberty and Equality.
... there are common natural laws of socialist construction, deviation from which could lead to development of a country's power, and when external and internal forces hostile to socialism try to turn the development of a given socialist country in the direction of restoration of the capitalist system, when a threat arises to the security of the socialist commonwealth as a whole — this is no longer merely a problem for that country's people, but a common problem, the concern of all socialist countries."

The Brezhnev-big brother Doctrine articulates the Soviet polemic mentality. Interference into the affairs of any Eastern European country constitutes a Soviet right, to be exercised at their discretion.

However, despite Soviet aggression in Eastern Europe, the U.S. chose to go off on a frolic of its own and disregard the lessons of history. Of course, one must keep in mind that Detente is not a Nixon, Ford or a Carter creation. Since the end of the Cold War, both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. have fought detente, i.e., the easing of tensions in international relations. Detente is not the process by which a permanent goal is its final achievement. Rather, it is a continuous process of stabilization, relaxation and of mutual restraint. In essence, it is a willingness of accommodation and cooperation under a framework of uniform principles.

Detente has been coined as "peaceful coexistence." However, one must not overlook Stalin’s statement on December 3, 1927 in a political report to the Central Committee of the 15th Congress of the CPSU: "...peaceful coexistence is therefore a strategy which will carry forth the communist revolution to the final overthrow of the free world and the establishment of communism." In 1973, a prominent Polish theoretician, J. Kucera, stated: "Every trend toward peaceful coexistence is at the same time a giant step toward an intensification of the ideological struggle." Hence, Detente to the Soviets is a doctrine by which disarmament, economic cooperation and cultural exchanges may take place without the discontinuation of ideological warfare, i.e., the obliteration of free thought.

The Helsinki Agreement, a child of detente, was the end result of two years of hard negotiations between 493 diplomats from 35 nations at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). CSCE was initiated by Foreign Minister Rapacki of Poland in 1965. In 1969, the Warsaw Pact Foreign Minister revealed the prerequisites for the manifestation of European Security as being: a) the recognition of the German Democratic Republic as a separate and independent state; b) the inviolability of the existing borders in Europe; and c) a renunciation from the Federal Republic of Germany of their possession of nuclear arms. However, it is evident that the Soviets(1) were undertaking a venture that would not only preserve the geopolitical status quo, but would establish its predominance in Eastern Europe; (2) to reaffirm the primacy of the Eastern "bloc" as being a Soviet "Cordon Sanitaire;" (3) to reduce the East-West tension in order to avoid a possible two-front confrontation (in the event Sino-Soviet relations deteriorated into war); (4) to improve their cold war image and publicly divorce themselves from the crude methods of Stalinization; (5) to increase their influence with the Western Communist Parties, and reaffirm their willingness to continue socialist internationalism through peaceful collaboration, and (6) to diminish U.S. participation in Western Europe by creating an atmosphere of detente and yet prevent the emergence of a powerful united Europe.

The signing of the Helsinki Agreement once more exemplifies the footholdness of U.S. foreign policy. The signing not only recognized the permanent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviets (a de facto legitimation of the Brezhnev Doctrine), but it also provided massive Western economic aid and technology as well as a market for jeans, coca-cola, rock music and bubble gum. It is quite obvious that technological backwardness, inadequate planning and mismanagement along with the lack of morale on the part of labor force were the main reasons for the decline of world exports from the U.S.S.R. and the Eastern bloc during 1966 and 1973. The rising cost in raw materials and energy in the early 1970’s coupled by the rude awakening of the Soviets that their own natural resources were not infinitely inexhaustible, and the growing awareness that it was to their disadvantage in trading within the bloc, motivated the Soviets to negotiate at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. On the other hand, the U.S. may have thought that Humanitarian, Cultural and Educational cooperation would somehow thaw the Soviet bloc.

Detente and the goals sought from the Helsinki Agreement are a delusion. To contain communism and Soviet expansion the U.S. must assert unyielding force. Such force need not necessarily be military. However, the U.S. must credibly be willing to use diplomacy backed by a "big stick."

This, of course, does imply that military force may and will occasionally be used. The U.S. should follow "linkage diplomacy," i.e., link foreign and trade policy with Soviet foreign policy. Hence, if the Soviets are willing to take a cavalier stance in Poland, then the U.S. should appropriately terminate diplomatic, commercial and cultural ties. It is not to the U.S.'s advantage to provide the Soviets or any other bloc country with technology or grain or any other type of economic aid if the Soviets are willing to flagrantly violate the territorial integrity of other nations. However, it is obvious that the Helsinki Agreement is a mere de facto recognition of the Eastern European bloc as the Soviet sphere of influence. Therefore, the U.S. has already impliedly assented to a Soviet invasion in Poland. In the words of Alexander Solzhenitsyn: "What does the spirit of Helsinki and the spirit of detente mean for us within the Soviet Union? The strengthening of totalitarianism. What seems to you a milder atmosphere, a milder climate, is for us the strengthening of totalitarianism."

continued from page 2

Metzenbaum, then tries to remedy the problems its controls created by using political arbitrariness, coercion, and an army of bureaucrats when the pricing system could have solved the problem using the free decisions of all the citizens.

There is a common thread which runs through the liberal thinking of the Cleveland lineup, Eckart to Stokes to Metzenbaum. That is, the government, and therefore they, can decide better than you what wage is proper for a job, how to spend your money, and how to live your life.

The theory that an unelected bureaucracy in Washington knows more than 226 million people spread throughout this diverse country is false. That the common worker should have to pay for this false thinking, to the detriment of his freedom and economic health, is no longer bearable.

continued from page 7

The whole movement has a schizoid character — the members compensate for their failure in real human relationships by creating an illusory ideal world of fondness, intimacy and delight. (Anthony Storr, Human Agression, pp. 121-22.)

I was quite wrong about their attitudinal change towards housewives. Shirley MacLaine, second only to Jane Fonda among tinsel-town's feminists, was quoted in the January 11, 1981 Ask Stephanie column (Plain Dealer) as saying, regarding the difference between the hookers and the housewives she portrays, "It's just a question of price." She speaks for herself... and others like her.

I much prefer a woman like Taylor Caldwell who has written numerous novels among them Answer as a Man and The Captains and the Kings which was made into a television series. Asked what she felt about such an honour, she replied:

"There is no solid satisfaction in any career for a woman like myself. There is no home, no true freedom, no hope, no joy, no expectation for tomorrow, no contentment. I would rather cook a meal for a man and bring him his slippers and feel myself in the protection of his arms than have all the citations and awards and honours I have received worldwide, including the Ribbon of the Legion of Honour and my property and my bank accounts." She too, speaks for herself and others like her... men and women who know what life's priorities happen to be.  

— M.V.-S.
Business of all types, and throughout the ages, has often been conducted within the lubricious ambiance of the tavern. In the West of Ohio, and the Great Lakes region, the traditions outlived the social mores and not been properly consummated without a denouement of Guinness stout. Never mind that most other events in Ireland conclude similarly.

It should not, then, be with surprise that we observe the decline of trial advocacy, as the business of lawyers' negotiation moves from the cold stone of the courthouse to the warm wood of the tavern. Indeed, solicitation has always been a barroom pastime.

It was thus that a Gavel/Editor embarked on a thankless journey on which he sought, artful soul that he is, to review a smattering of cocktail lounges East of the River, solely for the furtherance of his classmates' careers. It should be noted that, in posturing for this survey, the traditional distinction between "counsel" and "defendant" became somewhat blurred, as indeed did distinctions of events generally.

Greenhouse, on Cornell Rd. and Murray Hill, is a fine place to go and be ignored by Western Reserve law students, who, learning the declarant is a C-M attendee, is often torn between inquiring whether "Marshall" is a high school on the Near-West Side, or spewing spittle droplets on your forehead in a superior fashion. Seek sympathy, and not respect, there.

Just a ten-minute reckless drive from there is the North Union Gristmill, where the tavern-goer is afforded the affectionate reception given Carpetbaggers in the South. It is important never, ever to smile or tell a joke in the Gristmill. You'll be ignored far less by being recognized.

You'll be happy you left the Gristmill early, and even your dented car when arriving at Settler's Tavern, a two-minute steepish walk away at the top of Buckeye Road. Go ahead, put your pants on your head. Better yet, put your neighbor's pants on your head. They don't care. They'll know its funny, and you'll still be better behaved than the regulars.

Leaving Settlers always leaves me a little misty-eyed and melancholy; partly because you've left the gang behind, and partly because your car stereo is irrevocably stolen. But not to worry. You'll be singing Rugby songs by now, with a 9-8 complete strangers. Don't hesitate to ask their help in driving. In a Democracy, driving should be a participatory event.

O.K. Get that G.T.O. off the cinder blocks, pump up those air shocks, and rear down to Euclid Tavern, or the "Justice Center Adjunct," as it is also known. Just the spot to meet defendants of all kinds. Look straight ahead, order a long neck beer, and don't even think bad thoughts about bikers. It is wise to address individuals of either gender as "sir" here. Meekly grovel out the back door, forget your hapless companions, and run as fast as your motor-impaired little legs will carry you.

While its an even bet that you'll never get auto insurance again, its worth the weave out to the Greenville in Chagrin Falls. If you manage never to use proper grammar and give no indications of any literacy whatsoever, they may mistake you for one of the locals and not beat you up too badly.

If they don't, why not careen up to the patio at Gameskeeper's Tavern? You'll instantly feel the disdain of the aristocracy, and finally be unburdened by the esteem that's been accumulating for so long.

Ready for a change of pace? Then perhaps the perfect spot for a morning cap for you is at M--'s, an interesting place, if a little hard to find — as well it might be, as it opens its secret doors at 3 a.m. My own date was in tears by this time. The regulars of the milo saloon, M--'s, on East 9 Street, checks one's hangdog, rather than one's coat, at the door, which seemed a reasonable service to me. Don't hesitate to tip.

If you've managed to avoid the restive attitude of the rural conurbation up to this point, you've been lucky, and have earned an honest daytime's sleep. Never mind about class; you've learned enough about criminality for one day.

For these reasons, the congressman advocates the use of special and refundable tax credits to reimburse companies that invest in modern equipment and machinery to improve productivity and quality, and therefore the competitiveness on American products vis-a-vis foreign products. He also favors the use of tariffs and/or import quotas to protect American industries. He noted that other nations not only erect tariff barriers and impose import quotas, they may govern key industries that protect their domestic industries. He stated that other nations not only erect tariff barriers and impose import quotas, they may govern key industries that protect their domestic industries.

The congressman believes that attracting new industries to these regions is not enough, and must be accomplishments of any improvement in the fortunes of the auto and steel industries.

There are features of these regions that may make this attempt workable; bringing these areas back to viability is "not a lost cause by any means." The regions' good education system, trained labor force, access to water, and even the energy crunch, combine to make the Northwest and the Midwest attractive to industries. The regions have roads, plants, and schools that can be put to use when federal funds are not used to duplicate these facilities in other regions of the country. The congressman feels that those in government are aware of the problems now. He calls for a national consensus and decision to revitalize the industries and the cities of the North.

Regardless of the congressman's belief that the role of the federal government is perhaps not really critical to the solution of these problems, it becomes obvious that at the very minimum the beginning of such solutions do require bold and determined actions on the part of the federal government. Our government protected and assisted American industry in its infancy and during its growth, and it must do so now in its revitalization.