ON STUDENT SUICIDES

Suicide has increased steadily among American adolescents, and the cause can be described as "progressive isolation from meaningful social relationships," says sociologist Jerry Jacobs after an intensive study of attempted suicide by 56 adolescents from 16 to 18 years of age.

There is a long-standing history of problems, usually beginning in childhood. With the onset of adolescence, problems increase, for a variety of reasons, and the youth's attempts to find means of coping with these problems end in failure. Less drastic actions are tried, and fail; there is no one to give help, and death seems the only alternative.

This is a conscious and rational choice, Dr. Jacobs insists, and he rejects most of the current work on the subject because, it is said, to find unconscious and irrational motives. The victim tells, or writes, what he feels, and this is adequate proof, Dr. Jacobs says, in the path toward prevention, in the author's view. These are not isolated cases, the issue is not the school, but the argument would seem to hold good equally in the college years. The youth's attempts to find means of coping with these problems end in failure. Less drastic actions are tried, and fail; there is no one to give help, and death seems the only alternative.

The difference between being successful in life and being mediocre is that little extra bit of effort put into all endeavors. If extra effort, then, is the key to success, judge for yourself.

R.V.S.P.: TENURE

There are three committees investigating the renewal for promotion and tenure. Each committee is seeking student input into the possible promotion or tenure of Professors Emerson, Goshen, and Sonnenfeld. Please send all pertinent information to Dean Christensen's office and the ad hoc committee chairman.

Chairmen for Emerson's Committee are professors Sieck & Sheard.
Chairmen for Goshen's Committee are professors Oleck & Aldrich.
Chairmen for Sonnenfeld's Committee are professors Cohen & Flaherty.

SECOND HIGHEST BAR SCORE

The faculty of the Cleveland-Marshall College of Law of Cleveland State University extends its congratulations to Dwight Miller for his outstanding accomplishment in attaining the second highest score in the July, 1971, Ohio Bar Examination. By his achievement, Mr. Miller has brought credit to the school as well as to himself. The faculty joins his fellow students in taking pride in Mr. Miller's demonstration of his mastery of the material on the examination and wishes him outstanding success in his legal career.
COOPERATION NEEDED

Now that the new officers have taken their seats on the Student Bar, and the confusion and great, nearly overwhelming, emotionality and enthusiasm of the election is over, the time has come for us to attack the problems, both old and new, facing the student body and the university. It is of the utmost urgency that action be taken in many areas immediately, but not just to get the bar rolling, but to de-emphasize any day-night dichotomy and override last years inaction. The list of these areas that demand immediate attention is too lengthy for this column. The important point is not the issues, for they will be solved, but our effective promotion of the students it represents. Of equal importance is cooperation. Only after cooperation among the S.B.A. senators can they become an effective functioning force in this school. But if the year brings problems and fruitless efforts, let's look not at the S.B.A. alone. Let each one of us reflect on our own efforts—a introspection of our own failings. We are all culpable for the success or failure of this school year.

We have the ability to have an effective S.B.A., now let's carefully but forcefully move forward together to solve our problems.

SBA GETS BIG VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

No elected representative of this university should count on any support from the apathetic students of Cleveland State. Now often have we criticized the student government for being an apathetic bastardizing appendage. But the last election illustrated the exact location from which this appendage emanates—the STUDENTS.

An "I don't give a damn" attitude has marred the joy of any victory. It is distressing to the editors that a student can be elected to the S.B.A. by a total of five votes out of a class of 144 voters. It is embarrassing to realize that only 303 votes elected the student body president of the university out of an enrollment of 3,300 students—1 per cent.

Your elected representatives come into office without the support they need. We hope that despite this vote of confidence, the S.B.A. and the main campus government will get down to work and produce for the few concerned colleagues that merit their efforts.

YOUR SENIOR PICTURES

What personal remnant from our past will be permanently embedded in the archives of Cleveland State University? There were only 30 senior law students who had their year book pictures taken last week. The remaining 100 or more graduates from our hallowed halls will be listed in absentia. True to a living memory and accurate reflection on the apathetic students of C.S.U. Congratulations!

FINANCIAL AID

A GREATER NEED

"A good education is a more valuable asset than a house or a business or both because it can help to produce both, plus enriching a person's life in many ways not measurable by any dollars and cents yardstick. When you consider this, then the value of the education of a college education becomes much smaller." (Financial Aid Bulletin CSU)

More students than ever are entering our already crowded colleges and universities. Our law school alone has increased from 145 day students in 1949 to 186 in 1970. The last five years has seen an increase from last year's 20 percent from 1969, 35 percent from 1968. Due to this surge in enrollment and across America, the problem of financial aid skyrockets. The money is there for every student in the populace. Even at that, once one has qualified the amount available just isn't enough. The money available isn't increasing proportionately to the students entering college. What's worse is that the amount available isn't increasing enough to cope with the economical trends of today.

Outside the universities the same problem is felt. Banks and Savings and Loans are simply tied down and unable to assist the college students. Part-time and summer employment has also taken a plunge to the bottom of the economic charts and graphs. Government holds the big key to the answer of our problem. But are they ready to help?

At every turn the student is blocked by first, rising interest rates on loans which make the banks least likely to help us unless they get a fat rate of return and second, loans are almost nonexistent at a central rate of less than 3 percent which gives the ambitious student no means to help himself, especially when student unemployment is nearly 30 percent. Third, a complete change of our government financial aid programs has only set standards to help the poor and has left middle class students the burden of self-help. Finally, the rising cost of living, temporarily from after the tuition raise, and education which have decreased the student aid for the middle and upper class students, and private scholarships have also increased the cost of running our colleges.

On the local scene, there is hope in the Ohio Instructional Grant Program plus $500 million to Federal financial aid programs. Still, on has to wonder at what point the laws of supply and demand will hit us. President Nixon thinks it should be now, and this is illustrated by his powerful veto over the plan to appropriate for federal financial aid programs. Logically his goal is to increase the turnover in National Defense Student Loans or to decrease the availability of funds. Surely, the most dreaded move would be to cut back on NDSL completely. Then students would be forced to go to bank loans at 7 percent. But the biggest threat in the near future is the Student Work-Study Program in which they subsidize the students pay by 75 percent of their gross income.

This is the way future availability of funds is headed and there seems to be no way to stop it. As Government aid affects the middle class in such a way as to drive them into a situation with only two choices. One is to accept the federal aid squeeze and cut back on their own ability to work these financial aid budgets or the alternatives, live with the money they have.

As law students, we too are faced with this problem. We've made our way through the four years of college and now there are three or four more years of squeezing to get through.

There is an answer that lies outside the area of the nearly $900,000,000 of student aid available. We can isolate the problems and say, "There must be a change to decrease the interest rate, curb unemployment, reach a more equitable means of distributing aid and stop the inflation," but the answers are our concern.

Here in the law school, 150 students are under a financial aid program of 770. Last year only 70 were under the financial aid program that the government provided. In 1969 the total financial aid was $192,000 of which these students utilize $93,000 or $1.50 per student a year on one of the financial aid programs. This year there is only $207,000 available, a 5 percent increase in funds for a 13 percent increase in students. The reason for the non-use of these funds are compounded with aforementioned problems plus the law student is plagued by a "Parents' Confidential Statements" and other standards which are meaningless and burdensome to these 70 students.

The trend of our college students is for a tight financial struggle. This is the sign of the times that we face as law students. If the trend continues we will become further burdened as the years squeeze on.

Mrs. Carole Czeck, secretary to the Dean and Financial Aid Consultant at Cleveland State University, says that a grant program to help students with their mid-year and spring financial aid needs is being set up. All graduate and undergraduate students, special care should be given to our graduate program to guarantee these students this higher education. Since the graduate studies programs are fully funded by financial aid programs, the middle and upper class students can generally afford to go on to a M.S., M.B.A., J.D., M.D., D.D.S. or Ph.D. Now the funds are compounded by a federal move to channel all federal aid to college studies. The reason for this development is the Student Work-Study Program in which they subsidize the students pay by 75 percent of their gross income.

To the editors, On behalf of the Elections Committee I want to thank the Gavel staff for publishing the election issue. We are sure this provided a good vehicle toward an informed (and calm) electorate.

Marilyn G. Zack
THE OHIO BAR EXAM - 1971

Cleveland State University's performance on the bar examination this past July is nothing less than monumental. Ranking the law schools by their respective passing averages, Chart II shows C.S.U. ranking number 6. In the last 10 years Cleveland-Marshall (C.S.U.) has never ranked higher than eighth among the nine Ohio law schools. From 1961 to 1970 our sole challenger for first place has been Ohio Northern. (See Chart II) (p. 5).

This year Case Western Reserve, Ohio Northern, and Toledo slipped below C.S.U. One reason for this increase can be credited to a stronger curriculum. The course schedule offered and the number of credit hours given could be the prime cause of our increased performance on the bar examination. Again, the Non-Ohio law schools would seem to be preparing their students more effectively for Ohio's bar exam than Ohio schools. This is indicated by the 5 percent higher passing average (Chart I) by the Non-Ohio law schools over the past 21 years.

The most important analytical statement ever made is that the March bar exam has become increasingly easier to pass and the July bar more difficult. (Chart & Graph I). In 1969 and 1971 the data proves that the applicant for admission to the bar of the state of Ohio has a 16 percent better chance of passing the bar exam the first time if he takes it in March rather than July.

One important variable that will alter the face of the bar examination will be the multi-state bar examination. This is a multiple choice examination that will be uniformly taken by applicants for admission to the bar of California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. The first offering of this exam will be February 23, 1972.

No longer will the bar examination consist of three days of essay questions. The National Conference of Bar Examiners will offer a multi-state multiple choice bar examination. The reason for the change is that, in 1969, 790 exams were graded. This mounting burden on bar examiners was caused by an increase in the number of applicants for admission to the bar which has almost doubled in five years.

In the short run, it appears that C.S.U. Law School graduates have a 68.5 percent chance of passing the bar exam in their first attempt. Other Ohio law schools have similar chances. The passing rate of Ohio non-Ohio law schools is 71.3 percent, which 1.6 percent fail the bar exam from 1961-1970.

Another important variable is that only 1.6 percent fail the bar exam in March rather than July. (Chart II) (p. 5). The reason for this increase can be credited to a stronger curriculum. The course schedule offered and the number of credit hours given for admission to the bar of the state of Ohio has a 16 percent better chance of passing the bar exam the first time if he takes it in March rather than July.

Yes, the bar examination results don't look all that promising. Yet, we all have a new experience awaiting us. The best answer for all concerned is:

A.) An assurance that only 1.6 percent fail the bar exam in March.
B.) The 16 percent greater chance of passing the bar exam in March, if he takes it in March rather than July.
C.) The trend of C.S.U. among Ohio law schools will increase from 6th to 4th place.
D.) The Multistate bar exam will allow more people to pass the bar exam.

No. 1: Of the reasons cited was that the law school curriculum, especially in the first 21 years, has changed, in most states, over a period of many years. To the almost total exclusion of modern subjects, the traditional standbys of Contracts, Torts, Criminal Law, etc., continue to dominate both the bar exam and the curriculum. The topics of contracts, criminal law, evidence, real property & torts will consist of 6 questions from 1-4 both days. The exam contains 6 questions from 9-12. The exam will be first scheduled to be given February 23, 1972.

The most significant change involves the adoption of Day 2 for the Multistate Exam. Each of the other states who have elected to give this exam have the option to give one or more additional days for purposes of the given examination. The state of Ohio has traditionally set up a 3 day program of essay questions of which students could complete the multiple part of 4 questions of the given section. This year Days 1 & 3 will consist of 6 questions from 9-12 noon & 6 questions from 1-4 both days. The questions are not categorized into subject & there is no option—You answer all 24 questions.

On Day 2 there will be 200 multiple choice questions, each having four alternative answers. This gives the candidate a 1 in 4 chance to answer each question. Unfortunately, only one answer is the best answer. The exam is strictly common law & no statutory knowledge is necessary except where the statute is printed in the question.

There is no question of reciprocity between the Ohio and other states that will offer this multistate bar exam. It does not exist. So, if you plan to take the bar exam in a state where it will be given, you had better plan on leaving the last Wednesday in February & the last Wednesday in July open.

BAR EXAMINATION SYMPOSIUM
by Paul T Kirner

MANDATE: MODERNIZATION

Bar examinations, unlike wine, have not mellowed with age, nor does it appear likely that they will, despite the "clear and apparent danger" that portends their eventual demise. The mandate for modernizing bar examinations and law school curricula, to parallel the needs of contemporary society, has been more apparent in recent years than ever before. While the pace of industry and commerce have forced the executive body to look to the future, in a struggle to remain abreast of new developments and techniques, the legal profession (to its own detriment) has ignored continuous opportunities to prepare its practitioners for our brave new world. Recently, the like, bar examiners have continued to ignore these subjects, perhaps trusting that these, like poverty and other urban problems, may just go away or resolve themselves, if ignored.

Bar examinations remain little changed, in most states, over a period of many years. To the almost total exclusion of modern subjects, the traditional standbys of Contracts, Torts, Criminal Law, etc., continue to dominate both the bar exam and the curriculum. The topics of contracts, criminal law, evidence, real property & torts will consist of 6 questions from 1-4 both days. The exam contains 6 questions from 9-12. The exam will be first scheduled to be given February 23, 1972.

The most significant change involves the adoption of Day 2 for the Multistate Exam. Each of the other states who have elected to give this exam have the option to give one or more additional days for purposes of the given examination. The state of Ohio has traditionally set up a 3 day program of essay questions of which students could complete the multiple part of 4 questions of the given section. This year Days 1 & 3 will consist of 6 questions from 9-12 noon & 6 questions from 1-4 both days. The questions are not categorized into subject & there is no option—You answer all 24 questions.

On Day 2 there will be 200 multiple choice questions, each having four alternative answers. This gives the candidate a 1 in 4 chance to answer each question. Unfortunately, only one answer is the best answer. The exam is strictly common law & no statutory knowledge is necessary except where the statute is printed in the question.

There is no question of reciprocity between the Ohio and other states that will offer this multistate bar exam. It does not exist. So, if you plan to take the bar exam in a state where it will be given, you had better plan on leaving the last Wednesday in February & the last Wednesday in July open.

CLASSE OF 1972

MULTISTATE - JULY & FEBRUARY

The National Conference of Bar Examiners has clarified policy on the new Multistate Bar Exam, first scheduled to be given Feb. 25, 1972.

The most significant change involves the adaptation of Day 2 for the Multistate Exam. Each of the other states who have elected to give this exam have the option to give one or more additional days for purposes of the given examination. The state of Ohio has traditionally set up a 3 day program of essay questions of which students could complete the multiple part of 4 questions of the given section. This year Days 1 & 3 will consist of 6 questions from 9-12 noon & 6 questions from 1-4 both days. The questions are not categorized into subject & there is no option—You answer all 24 questions.

On Day 2 there will be 200 multiple choice questions, each having four alternative answers. This gives the candidate a 1 in 4 chance to answer each question. Unfortunately, only one answer is the best answer. The exam is strictly common law & no statutory knowledge is necessary except where the statute is printed in the question.

There is no question of reciprocity between the Ohio and other states that will offer this multistate bar exam. It does not exist. So, if you plan to take the bar exam in a state where it will be given, you had better plan on leaving the last Wednesday in February & the last Wednesday in July open.

MULTISTATE 1973?

Reprint from the University of San Diego School of Law—The Woolsack Vol. 9 No. 2.

At press time, the future of the proposed multiple-choice bar exam is still in doubt. However, the State Senate Judiciary Committee took action last week which almost surely will place the multiple-choice portion on the February Bar, with a similar bleak outlook for its chances on subsequent examinations.

One of the reasons cited was that the law does not lend itself to a yes-no, true-false type of testing. For example, if a lawyer refused to answer a question, the bill have cited that another answer might be considered correct, thus, vindicating the defendant or the like. It is not clear whether the bill will be passed.

The most current information available indicates that the neighboring states of Oregon and Nevada will still participate in the Multistate Exam.
MEMORANDUM

TO: The Community

FROM: Cleveland Marshall

PASS JULY BAR EXAM

ADLER, ALLEN P.
BAILEY, EARL P.
BAKER, MARTIN
BARRETT, STEPHEN E.
BESSING, ELMER A.
BITTEL, TIMOTHY M.
BREIT, CHARLES G.
BRUENING, FRANCINE M.
BURKE, JEROME L. JR.
CIRCELLO, DON

CONTO, JOSEPH S.
CORT, KENNETH M.
CRISAFI, FRANK R.
DAVIS, THOMAS E.
DIELCO, ROBERT J.
ESPER, THOMAS L.
FLANAGAN, TIMOTHY M.
GANSONS, PARLICK L.
GARFINKEL, ROBERT L.
GARVEY, PATRICK F.
GELFAND, EUGENE M.

GLENN, DOUGLAS
GNANZ, PATRICK J.
GORDON, HOWARD D.
GRACE, CHARLES H.
GRAFT, MAYAARD L. JR.
Graham, Edward M.
HARTMAN, SHIRLEY R.
HAYES, THOMAS P.
HUTCHINSON, GERALD J.
HUM, ERNEST E. JR.
JAMES, LYNDALL G.
KOIKE, SHOJA M.
KAPPI, CHARLES T.
KARNES, WILLIAM H.
KATZ, GEORGE R.
KAT, MILTON

KAUFMANN, ROY M.

KOFF, JAMES M.
KOHN, WILLIAM M.
KOMARJANSKI, STEPHEN

Date: October 10, 1971
Re: 84 New Advocates

KOMOROWSKI, JAMES J.

LA PLANTE, ROLAND P.
LEKOM, ROBERT S.
LERoux, CLAYTON
LEVINE, ELLIS R.
LIECHMAN, JEFFREY E.
LIEDEK, WILLIAM P.
LONABARDI, JOHN J.
MARINE, CARMEN M.
MATAS, VYTAS R.
MARY, JAMES J.

MELL, JAMES E.
MILLER, DWIGHT
MITZNER, JAY M.

MORRIS, JESSE E.
MORROW, DAVID W.
MURPHY, CHARLES T. JR.
MURTAGH, FRANCIS D. JR.

NAWALANIE, FRANK J.
NEBEN, ENGEEN
NERREN, GEORGE V.
NOBILIO, DAVID L.
NUSBAUM, ALAN

O'DONNELL, TERRY
OLEKSHIUS, DONALD
PENCA, GERALD F.
PLESS, WILLIAM T.

RICHARDS, DAVID J. JR.
ROSENTHAL, RALPH J.
SHOOP, JOHN E.
SIMMONS, GERALD G.

STARKE, SHELDON
STEELE, ROBERT H.

STEIN, STANLEY R.
STONEMAN, JAMES D.

WALDOE, MICHAEL
WALL, F. DOUGLAS

WALSH, EDWARD
WARRIEN, JACK D.
WEISS, RICHARD A.

WAXNOW, MAX
ZELE, RONALD
ZACKERMAN, RICHARD

CHARLES MOSLEY COMMISSIONER EAST CLEVELAND

AMERICA

SENATE BILL 14 PASSED AT LAST

(Amended Senate Bill No. 14)

AN ACT

To amend section 4511.19 of the Revised Code relative to operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio:

SECTION 1. That section 4511.19 of the Revised Code be amended to read as follows:

Sec. 4511.19. No person who is under the influence of alcohol or any drug of abuse shall operate any vehicle, streetcar, or trackless trolley within this state. In any criminal prosecution for a violation of this section, or ordinance of any municipality relating to driving a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol, the court may admit evidence on the concentration of alcohol in the defendant's blood at the time of the alleged violation as shown by chemical analysis of the defendant's blood, urine, breath, or other chemical analysis of a sample of the defendant's blood, urine, breath, or other bodily substance withdrawn within two hours of the time of such alleged violation. When a person submits to a blood test at the request of the person who was tested, the person tested may have a physician, or a registered nurse shall withdraw blood for the purpose of determining the alcoholic content therein. This limitation does not apply to the taking of breath or urine specimens. Such bodily substance shall be analyzed in accordance with methods approved by the director of health by an individual possessing a valid permit issued by the director of health pursuant to section 3701.14 of the Revised Code. Such evidence gives rise to the following:

(A) If there was at that time a concentration of less than ten hundredths of one per cent by weight of alcohol, but more than five hundredths of one per cent by weight of alcohol, in the defendant's blood, such fact shall not give rise to any presumption that the defendant was or was not under the influence of alcohol, but such fact may be considered with other competent evidence in determining the guilt or innocence of the defendant.

(B) If there was at that time a concentration of ten hundredths of one per cent or more by weight of alcohol in the defendant's blood, it shall be presumed that the defendant was under the influence of alcohol.

(C) If there was at the time a concentration of five hundredths of one per cent or less by weight of alcohol in the defendant's blood, it shall be presumed that the defendant was not under the influence of alcohol.

Upon the request of the person who was tested, the results of such test shall be made available to him, his attorney, or agent, immediately upon the completion of the test analysis.

The person tested may have a physician, or a qualified technician, chemist, registered nurse, or other qualified person of his own choosing administer a chemical test or tests in addition to any administered at the direction of a police officer, and shall be so advised. The failure or inability to obtain an additional test by a person shall not preclude the admission of evidence relating to the test or tests taken at the direction of a police officer.

Section 3. That existing section 4511.19 of the Revised Code is hereby repealed.

CHARLES F. KURFESS
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

JOHN W. BROWN
President of the Senate.

TED W. BROWN
Secretary of State.

JOHN J. GILLIGAN
Governor.

OHIO IS NOW A .10% STATE

License—
to drink?

All but four states and the District of Columbia have "implied consent laws," which in effect mean a person who takes out a license to drive also consents to take a chemical test if arrested for drunk driving. But unless the legal "presumptive level"—blood-alcohol level indicating intoxication—is down to .10 percent, the consent laws lose meaning. Research shows that probability of accidents multiples rapidly above this level. Only 25 states have the .10 percent level. Utah has a more ideal low of .08 percent. Three states, however, have no presumptive level whatsoever.

INTERVIEWS SCHEDULED

(As of Nov. 16, 1971)

FALL QUARTER—1971-72

Nov. 11, COZZA & STEUER
Nov. 16, U.S. COAST GUARD

Nov. 17, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION
Nov. 18, REGINALD HEBER SMITH FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, 10:00 p.m., Room 101

Nov. 19, 29, KIRKPATRICK, LOCKHART, JOHNSON, HUTCHISON
Nov. 23, INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

Nov. 30, NLRB
SUICIDE CONT'D

NOT A DYING BUSINESS

(From page 1)

non-expert and then some.”

Dr. Jacobs mentions many other difficulties, one of which is the point of view, in many therapies, that the therapist should avoid “personal” contact. Dr. Jacobs describes this as being objective! But in this case a “personal relationship” is the one thing that may save his life. The expert is surrounded by records and case histories, may be seen only by appointment, infrequently and formally. Patients do not enter the home or the private life of the worker, nor do they violate his 40-hour week. To reach the worker, the patient must act through intermediaries for example, secretaries and receptionists. Beyond all this, many students have said that they would hesitate to consult a college psychiatrist to whom they might be referred because of the fact, in the record, might be a handicap in seeking employment in future years. It is to be hoped that such difficulties as these which Dr. Jacobs describes are not too frequent, but they do point clearly to the fact that, if the basic need for friendship, it may also be met profitably in a variety of other ways.

In this study he is dealing with a high school population, in which the college population conditions are still worse; and as most of the writers on the subject do not fail to mention, the variety of other ways. It may also be met profitably in a number of other ways.

The last meeting of the Faculty was broadcasted over WCSS Radio this week. Some of the debates were so heated that the cables began to sag in two places. The faculty moved unanimously against the following act, which was proposed by the student who had come up with a new idea. He said that the faculty had unanimously agreed that we can’t unanimously agree on anything.

When confronted by Gavel newsman, Judge Orange said there is no truth to the rumor that he was unfair in the selection of his clerks. Judge Orange, the strongest supporter of the knock on door search, said, “I don’t think it is unfair to his client when the judge ordered him gaggled & bound in the court room & ordered his client to proceed with the trial Mr. Kucharski said, “Not at all, after all he won didn’t he?”

RUMORS

by Paul T. Kinser

After the fantastic turnout of students at the CSU main campus & law school elections the newly elected students sat down & protested the fact & day with student legislation. We’re concerned students are working night & day with student legislation. We’re unanimous that we can’t unanimously agree that we can’t unanimously agree on anything.

In the past the RIGHT entrance door to the law school & the RIGHT door to the administration office were always locked.

In a rare appearance on the way to the executive wash room the Dean announced that from now on both RIGHT doors will be open & the LEFT door will be locked in place. What with everything else that is going on in the building will be opened on the left the Dean said, “No Comment.”

AND

Despite the fact that Dean Christensen did not allow the school of law to celebrate a holiday on Columbus day, there is no truth in the rumor that the Dean is related to Eric the Red. “Who,” says the Dean is the First Man to discover America.

The student aid committee of Cleveland State University gave a full scholarship and a loan to a student yesterday who was a marginal case as to whether he qualified for aid or not. The total package allows the student to maintain his simple life in Shaker Heights & keep up his payments on his new Lincoln.

HUMORS

MULTISTATE BAR CORNER

by Marvin E. Sable

MOTION TO STRIKE: Assault.
CLAIMS FOR RELIEF: Patent Medicine advertisements.
PERMISSIVE JOINER: Marriage of minors with consent of parents.
STATUTORY GRAPE: Felony in a vineyard.
INTENT TO CONTRACT: When two or more persons meet in an enclosed canvas area to enter into an agreement.
MANIFESTATION OF ASSENT: If one of the persons in the test above comes directly from the basketball court.
CAPACITY TO CONTRACT: The result of one’s failure to obtain flushot.
MUTUAL ASSENT: When all parties in the text above came from the basketball court.

BUCKLEY - WHERE IS OUR FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE? THE STUDENTS
Cleveland Bar Association

PROVIDING INPUT

Michael V. DiSalle, former Ohio Governor and Director of Economic Stabilization addressed the Cleveland Bar Association at its luncheon meeting on Tuesday, November 9, 1971 in the Cleveland Room of the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel. His subject was "Economic Controls Again." Controls Again."

Currently counsel to the Washington law firm of Chapman, Duff and Lenzine, Mr. DiSalle served as the Federal Director of Price Stabilization from 1950 to 1952, and during 1952 as the Director of Economic Stabilization.

About the current wage-price situation, Mr. DiSalle said, "The United States is due to go from recession to depression unless it makes use in a timely fashion of all the economic tools available."

IT MAY BE OUR LAST CHANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>November, 1966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HUMPHREY AT THE GATE

GREGORY IN THE STRETCH

CLEVELAND—Former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, now a U.S. Senator from Minnesota, will kick off the 1972 Cleveland State University Lecture Series.

Humphrey, 1968 presidential candidate and a possible candidate next year, will speak January 10.

The next speaker will be Peter Max, a graphic designer whose work has been seen not only on posters, but on clothing, household items, telephone directories and Cleveland city buses. Max will speak January 20th.

Journalist Gloria Steinem and community organizer Dorothy Pittman will discuss women's rights on February 21st. Miss Steinem, an advocate of "new journalism," is a contributing editor of New York magazine. Mrs. Pittman is a recognized expert on day care center organization and has founded a community controlled public school.

All lectures will be given in Trinity Cathedral, East 22nd Street and Euclid Avenue, and will begin at 2 p.m. Further, acclaimed American poet William Stafford will be featured April 5. He is the author of four books of poetry and three of prose, and has received the National Book Award in addition to many other honors.

The final speaker of the series will be Dick Gregory, a tireless champion of human rights who has achieved enormous success as a comedian, lecturer and best-selling author.

Gregory and Stafford will speak in First Methodist Church, Euclid and East 50th Street.

The public is invited to all Lecture Series programs. There is no admission charge.

ELECTION FINAL RETURNS

LARRY SMITH, PRESIDENT

FIRST YEAR DAY SENATORS

CARL F. NOLL DAVID FISHEIDEN KEN CALDWELL

The better way.
Students of C.S.U. Cleveland Marshall College of Law now have the opportunity, if not to get their feet wet, to at least get a toe damp by trying a mock case before an experienced judge and a jury of their peers. During this school year, Trial Preparation and Practice, a course in the first year (Trial Preparation), will once again be offered as part of the law school’s program to provide practical instruction and an opportunity for application of the law and procedure learned in other standard law school courses.

The courses were originally devised by Professors Flaherty, Simmons, and Spero. After the first class the students petitioned the LCOP Committee (Law Students’ Committee) for the opportunity to take a trial as a part of the program. The LCOP Committee believed in the value of the trial experience and allowed it to be conducted three times during the summer session.

The students started the school year during the summer, taking Legal History and Methods, Literature and some writing courses. The students then were allowed to participate in the Trial Preparation sessions, it was apparent that the students who tried their cases last made the most profound learning points from the prior cases. Because of this, it was decided that the courses would be offered on a pass/fail basis. When the courses were given again during the 1971 Summer Session, enough interest was shown to make it a full trial course. Enrollment was initially limited to twelve students per section, but approximately fifteen students were allowed in each section. Any more students in a section would have cut down on the free flow of ideas between the instructor and his students. All who have taken the courses and those who have taught them agree that the courses should continue to be taught on a small seminar basis in order to achieve maximum effectiveness.

The trial preparation course is taught by an experienced trial lawyer, who just happens to be a professor at the law school. In the past, Keith Spero, who is acknowledged as one of the leaders of the trial bar in the Cleveland area, taught the preparation for trial. Professor Auerbach, with over 30 years of trial experience, was drafted to conduct the added section this summer. The course offers the professors an opportunity to impart to the student the so-called “tricks of the trade” and how they have taken the course have found, intense preparation at every step of the case and at the trial and during the trial. The students are given the opportunity to “pick the brains of the professor.”

During the preparation sessions involved the enacting of a trial before Judge Robert Simmons and, during the past summer, Thomas G. Rowley of Chardon Municipal Court. The student lawyers are given a fact situation and must then interview their clients and witnesses. The clients and witnesses are those students who are not participating in a particular trial as attorneys. The trial proceeds with all the rules of evidence and procedure applying in Ohio courts, with one exception—the trial is recorded by the law school video-tape recorder.

After each trial, the video-tape is played back and the student can see and hear himself just as the jury did on the original run. The judge and the students then critique each other (Judge Rowley admitted that he had learned much about his own conduct of a trial during these sessions.)

Comments from students interviewed were consistent on the point that the Trial Preparation and Practice courses were the most fruitful courses taken in that they offered practical knowledge that, as Judge Rowley put it, gave the students a “feeling of familiarity with courtroom confidence as the demeanor of the lawyer improved with each session.

By taking these two courses the student has more work and perhaps may avoid some of the mistakes commonly made by young lawyers during their first year of practice.

DON’T JUST
THE CLASSROOM

by Lila Daum

Professor Cohen's style of conducting class recitation might be characterized as a dialogue which closely approaches dialectic. If the issue cannot be fully explored in the time allotted, at least every contributing factor will be apportioned to the student's attention by Hyman Cohen. After three hours of class the teacher is hoarse and the students are exhausted. They cannot recall ever having expended so much energy while sitting still. They have never so fully realized that thinking is tiring. And although tired—a chord strikes in the back of someone's mind that—"Look! The learning process was where the whole ballgame was tonight."

ORIENTATION NIGHT

by Lila Daum

I sat next to him at orientation night. When Marvin Sable, the student chairman of the orientation committee completed his introduction of Professor Hyman Cohen, the man sitting next to me stood up, casually removed his jacket, and strode over an hour his voice conducted a rally of scratching pencils and flipping pages. Yet his was not the performance of a cheerleader before a crowd. The young professor commanded the attention of the first year students in a way that only a great actor can hold an audience for a long and dramatic monologue. When he ended his lecture, the ovation he received bore out the analogy. He returned to his seat, his face flushed, and the air crackling with the energy and enthusiasm he had generated for the past hour. He seemed happy—Look, he'd just been where the whole ballgame is!
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