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October 5 and 6 the SBA, pursuant to the financial by-laws, passed the 1976-77 budget by an 11-3 margin. The budget is as follows:

Executive Bd. Oper. Expenses $650.
FORUM $1600
Professional Activities $5000
Social Committee $1750
BALSA 300
Chancellor Legal Society 150
Lawyer's Guild 100
Most Court 250
Softball 75
Third Year Class 300
WIRA 10

The biggest problem in distributing funds was how to make the special students budget requests totalled $14,524. The by-laws require that the proposed budget and any ultimate approved by the Executive Bd. shall have no deficit and shall not attempt to encourage any. Even though among many of the student fees returned was changed to $14.50 per student per semester the number was changed to the Department was that the student group's request for funding was included as well as an alternative source of funding. As the budget requests totalled $14,524.

Executive Bd. passed the 1976-77 budget by an $14,500. 1750
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Administrative Bd. passed the 1976-77 budget by an $14,500. 1750

The Law Faculty held its monthly meeting on Friday, October, 14th, 1976. The meeting was followed on several proposals excluding the Constitution and the Executive committee for faculty consideration.

Professor Beren presented a three-part proposal recommended by the Curriculum Committee. Among and qualified personnel who originated in part from discussions at the Faculty Retreat held earlier this fall and influenced by the student level, which may continue to be quite separate. We might result in the law school's interest? But, if it is that a law school increasingly in the larger pattern common in most universities.

It is that it tends to estrange the law student increasingly in the larger problems of the university. But, I think there always must be, by virtue of the differences I spoke of just a minute ago, a separation between the law school and the undergraduate students.

The present relationship, between the Student Bar Association and the University Senate, is left undefined. Do you feel this relationship should be defined or in some way provide for more law student input into the substantive matters with the Senate that presently deals?

I think all lawyers have some political instincts. One of the political aspects of this is that there are 15 student seats in the Senate (one-third of the Senate membership) and, right now, all are occupied by undergraduates. The problem is how should this be modified to include law school student representation? It would require a major change in the structure of the Senate. Yet, I think something should be done to see that one of these seats is assigned to law students. How persuasive the SBA officers might be in discussions with the Senate is a good test of their forensic abilities. Certainly, a solution must involve some considerable negotiation. But, I think it should be clear that many of the matters brought up in the Senate involve undergraduate life and that the representation of the law school, while theoretically a good idea, might result in the law school student representative involved in discussions which have little or no bearing on his constituency. So, I think you have to start from that point. Is there enough going on in the Senate that involves the law school's interest to be looked at? I think that is decided that there is, then, as I see this as a weakness of the curriculum? I think the type of curriculum provided is the responsibility of the law school faculty. They have evidently thought that the present situation is the best way to achieve their goals. I recognize that many of the other professions require some kind of field experience as a part of their program. In my opinion, it would be helpful for a law student to become acquainted with courtroom activities, but I would expect them to do that on their own just as I would expect a doctor on his own to see what was going on in the field of medicine. It just does not seem to me that we always have to require everything in a curriculum, particularly in a professional field. Since an individual has chosen to become part of a profession, he or she should want to become as well acquainted with it as they can.

The Law School Bulletin indicates that for the second and third year class, the class size is less for purposes of maximizing student participation. A majority of these classes have 35 or 40 students. Do you feel this class size can meet the goal of maximizing student participation? In this kind of thing, one always has to be looking ahead. Law school enrollments throughout the country are leveling off, and it may well be that in a few years, the numbers attending the law school will be considerably reduced. There are 29 fewer law student this year than last year.
Valparaiso Hosts ABA-LSD Fall Roundtable

by John Lee

While the food at the luncheon was not as good as the offerings at the registrants only two dollars, clearly the highlight of the day long affair was the address given by Attorney Jerry Paul of North Carolina. Paul spoke on the ineffective and biased delivery of justice in this country and the reasons for the law school adaptation. Paul offered many legal experiences of which he defended Joan Little is perhaps the best known, and of his views on organizing the law school and law students in this country to display the need to make changes in the law. He was not able to get justice in America for racial or economic condition.

The Roundtable also featured a videotape on gun control. Produced by John Marshall Law School under funding from an ABA grant, the film contained two speakers advocating opposing gun viewpoints on the issue.

In attendance were thirty-five law students from eleven of the fourteen law schools in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. In addition, five guest and staff members from the ABA who were on hand. The students who traveled to the first Fall Roundtable held outside the Chicago area made the meeting a success and a benefit program undertaken.

The workshop for ABA Law Student Division Representatives centered around a question and answer session. The Student Service Funds (SSF) of Law are a national, are given to individual law schools for projects designed and controlled by law students. Current projects under consideration in the Seventh Circuit are: Project Outreach – street law and high school education (Marquette Law School); the ABA’s Local Bar Services (Valparaiso); and National Institute on Women and Law (Washington). The workshop at the Roundtable was to discuss the proposed program for the new ABA-LSD Council in December.

Addressing the representatives’ workshop, the President of the Law Student Division, David Stoup of Kansas City, emphasized the importance of increased activity from the LSD Council and, in particular, the need for students to get involved and to provide input from the students on the LSD Council’s work. The LSD Council meeting was an opportunity for the LSD Council to exchange ideas and discuss matters of importance to LSD Council members.

The LSD Council meeting was held at the Valparaiso University School of Law on October 22, 1976, and was attended by approximately 50 LSD representatives from the national LSD Council. The LSD Council meeting was chaired by the LSD President, and a resolution was passed to establish a LSD Committee to work on LSD issues and to report back to the LSD Council.


discussion began as the LSD Council members discussed the need for increased LSD Council involvement and the importance of LSD Council members being active and involved in LSD Council matters. The LSD Council members also discussed the need for LSD Council members to be more active in LSD Council activities and to provide input from the LSD Council on LSD Council matters.

The LSD Council meeting was held at the Valparaiso University School of Law on October 22, 1976, and was attended by approximately 50 LSD representatives from the national LSD Council. The LSD Council meeting was chaired by the LSD President, and a resolution was passed to establish a LSD Committee to work on LSD issues and to report back to the LSD Council.

For any questions or comments regarding these matters, contact the LSD Representative, Carol Jones, of Victorville, California. ABA University School of Law.

Sincerely,

Hugo E. Martz
Assistant Professor of Law
Justice Clark Dedicates New Wing
High Court Upholds Death Penalty

By John Johnson

The U.S. Supreme Court on Monday, July 2, held that capital punishment is constitutional.

The court ruled that the law school must allow student groups to organize and hold meetings, including those that discuss political issues.

The decision comes in the case of邃. v. Lawrence School Board, which had challenged a student group's constitution.

The court said that the law school must allow the group to meet on campus, as long as it does so in an orderly and peaceful manner.

The case was brought by students at a law school who had been denied the right to hold meetings on campus.

The court ruled that the school had violated the students' rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution.

The court also upheld the constitutionality of the death penalty, saying it is a constitutional response to the most heinous of crimes.

"We have no choice but to uphold the death penalty," the court said in its opinion.

The court's decision on death penalty is a major victory for the pro-death penalty movement.
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The court has held that the government cannot restrict speech on the basis of viewpoint or content. 
by Dave Heiniger

Response to my list of suggestions in last issue's FORUM was overwhelmingly absent. The responses I did get ran along the lines of "What makes you think that will ever happen?" I guess we're just not ready for logic.

I think that of all the little things that don't add up, this experience, it is the apparent lack of foresight and considered planning in the day to day decision making that bothers me the most. I think that the lack of solid communications is directly related to those deficiencies.

Decisions that either directly or indirectly affect our Law School lives are made every day, it seems, without any notice or involvement of the student body. The student representatives whose duty it is to provide at least part of that involvement for us are simply not doing their jobs.

What is the information we are entitled to from such people as the student representatives to the various Law School committees? I am tired of trying to track down rumors about such things as new retention standards and door use policies.

While some of this information might seem trivial, there is a good deal of it which is serious and important, and to which we deserve better access. If you agree with me on this, remember it every time you place another solicitative election time rolls around in your lap.

This opinion is not an indictment of the Law School administration. My point is, what kind of a Law School do you want? We HAVE the mechanism available to us to be very well informed, involved members of this community. If we aren't, the malfunction of any of its various forms does not have the input of the student body in the decision-making process, we can only expect to get what they, without that input, think is best. Many times they will be right. Many times there will be a better way, un-thought of by the administration, to achieve legitimate ends by more logical means.

We accept too much without question. I fear too many namsy-pamsy students carry rubber stamps of their hip pockets. If it is the policy of this school to treat us as just one integral part of the administrative committee structure, and that IS the policy as I understand it, then we as students are being shortchanged.

As an interested member of this community, I want to know what new policies and decisions are being considered before they are implemented. Don't you? Everyone here is, purportedly, an adult, with at least some modicum of responsibility and ability to decide, to contribute to, the direction and administration of the three most important years of their lives.

As I stated earlier, that opportunity is available for those who dare, and who are willing to take the time and effort to see that opportunity doesn't go by default because some popular contest winner isn't doing the job. Onward and upward.

Hearsay

RAUNCHY RUMORS: It seems that Mike Peckovich has openly admitted that he doesn't mind women in law school as long as they don't talk and in-

A N D T H E Y S A Y I T... Rumors continue to circulate that the WLSA has appointed a woman to its newly formed Social Action Committee.

GORY: Congratulations to Rona Barretster, Al Mumford, and Roy Monrow on putting the Indiana Bar. This presumably means that these men will be gaining the remainder of the semester at a different kind of bar.

SPORTS: Ken Anderson's recruitment for his baseball team seems to be going very slowly; maybe if he signed up the experienced Dan Terbush, he could get a lot more action going. Randy Sproscas is predicting that Wisconsin will have a 7-4 record this season and is willing to bet a (high stakes only!) on this folly. . . .

As sports news, the word is out that Gale's mommy printed up "STUDENTS-At-Law" cards for the men to distribute around town. . . .

The WLSA social committee will hold a Homecoming Dance this year. . . .

SUCCESS SHORTS: The innovative Lilly Garrett, Dave Geiger, and Greg Hagen have started a successful research service for local attorneys. It's reported that this booming business was begun when Gale's mommy printed up "STUDENTS-At-Law" cards for the men to distribute around town. . . .

Denny Logan and Mike Bush attribute their success with women to the fact that they never give a girl a simple line twice. . . .

COSTUMES SURE TO SCORE A HIT AT THE SRA HOLLOWEEN DANCE: Barb Remoletti as a Dewey Decimal . . . Markkye Flyke as Rockey the Rquirrel . . . Matt Hyman as a monk . . .

DEAN MEYER as the Maltese Falcon, Mike Daw as Jaws . . . Fran Schaefer as the talking mule . . .

B SEE THE REST OF THE MOVIE WHILE YOU ARE HERE . . .

Halloween!

by Ronn Barretster

"Be the star of your next study group session with these juicy, titillating titbits."

Students will be the Keynote speaker.

The Willsing Bank . . .

Page Five

ORDER IN THE COURT

CHICAGO PAN PIZZA . . .

NOW TO GO

BAR OF JUSTICE

HAPPY HOUR

4 -6 P.M.

BICENTENNIAL DRINKS

MIXED DRINKS - $1.75

DRAFT BEER - $1.40

FOR CARRY-OUT ORDERS CALL 462-2141


HALLOWEEN!

by Debra Luzietti

Women Law Student's Association, formerly Women's Caucus, has elected its Executive Board for the 1976-77 year. The board consists of: President, Debra Luzietti; Vice-president, Jill Olson; Secretary, Ann Hartman; Treasurer, Ann Bush; and Faculty Representative, Doris McAndrew. The board also consists of nine class representatives, whose names were not available at press time. Membership in WLSA is open to all law students enrolled at Valpo.

WLSA's first project will be in conjunction with the Equal Rights Convention to be held at the IUPUD campus in Hammond on November 13. Gloria Steinem will be the keynote speaker. There will be a $1.00 donation to help pay her travel expenses.
The football season ended for Weseman Hall on the 13th of October as both the BARD and the Justice League of America went down in defeat at the hands of their Fraternity teams.

The BARD coming off their division title clinching win over Justice League could not get their offense rolling in the first half and fell behind at intermission as a Phi touchdown, and a safety put the legal locals in a 6-0 hole. The first squad then tucked on two second half scores before the law students began a belated push. BARD quarterback Chris Hunt, finding out what contact was the first time this year as his blocking softened, hit Greg Babcock in the end zone with less than five minutes left and later found Babs for a second six pointer with two seconds left in the game. Hunt hit the former and recently acquired Pike near-great, Bob Stochel for the first extra point and Joe "Casey Comment" Dimanowski for the second.

However, it was too little too late as the game ended with BARD on the short end of a 21-14 count. Thus BARD ended their season with a 4-0 mark but will be looking forward to next year as all the members save one will be back.

For the Justice League, it was the reverse as a poor second half doomed the elder law school team to a 1-4-0 loss to the Theta Chi's. The League led 6-0 at the half on a Scott Broman to Jim "El Producto Slim" Riells pass and missed a golden opportunity late in the first half when no one called time after Riells reception at the Theta fifty.

The second half was dominated by the Thetas who tallied twice to secure the contest to the Phi Delts two weeks ago. In an earlier win over Phi Delta. The contest to the Phi Delts two weeks ago was early in the morning on the 13th of October as both the BARD and Weseman Hall on the 13th of October as both the BARD and Weseman.

The reason given for this type of evidence was the conflict with the intramural football games that will be back.

No confidence in the intramural football games that will be back.

Law School Heads Up

The East Lincolnway Office (near Campus) remains open each day, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. for the convenience of Valparaiso University students. On Saturday the office is open until 12 noon.

First National Bank

116 E. Lincolnway
Valparaiso, Ind.
Phone 462-3188

First National Bank

Valparaiso University
462-5421

Theo "Chris Hunt" Kosjak; Licia "What's?" Stochel, and Bruce "What's-In-A-Name from the end of the faculty hall.

Recently, the Justice League of America is being kind enough to treat the BARD football squad to a legless Thanksgiving. Thanks guys—the game was one of the best and cleanest I've ever seen. Thanks for your time this time till next time. 

Chess Tourney Heats Up

The results of the Uces Tournamemt continue to flow in, (actually ebb or even oozes more like it) and as of Friday the 16th, the following results have been posted.

"John Lanning defeated Brian "Beemuts" Lee and will cross pawns with Dave Geisler, a winner over Bob Barker, Dave Capp and Stu Hyvonen have yet to do combat, but the two Of the "Bard" beat Jeff Bork and the first year students are dancing in the halls over that conquest.

In the lower bracket, defending champ Bruce Baby Bemer continued his march to retain his crown with a win over Jim Stan and will meet Ralph Gehrke, an upset winner over Kent "Well Tennis is my game anyway" Schnack last year's runner-up (Kent played sober this year.)

The Justice League of America, though not as strong as last year, has yet to play for the privilege of meeting Leonard Washington, the current victor over Ken Anderson.

The sports section opened this week with a five kick bounced of Stochel's chest for the first time since 1972. That was about the size of it, however, as two late Phi Delta goals against the tiring attorneys led to BARD's first defeat of the ever lengthening season.