

11-1972

The Adversary (Vol. 5, No. 5, November 1972)

Southern Methodist University School of Law

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.smu.edu/lawadversary>

Recommended Citation

Southern Methodist University School of Law, "The Adversary (Vol. 5, No. 5, November 1972)" (1972). *The Adversary*. 28.

<https://scholar.smu.edu/lawadversary/28>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School History and Archives at SMU Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Adversary by an authorized administrator of SMU Scholar. For more information, please visit <http://digitalrepository.smu.edu>.



THE

ADVERSARY

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Vol. 5, No. 5

DALLAS, TEXAS

November, 1972

PR...What's It Worth?

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 states, "that the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices in areas adjacent to the Interstate System and the primary system should be controlled in order to protect the public investment in such highways, to promote the safety and recreational value of public travel, and to preserve natural beauty." 23 U.S.C. 131a.

Yet, beginning in December 1970, the Texas Bar Association has been sponsoring 500 outdoor billboards proclaiming "Respect the law... protect your freedom. State Bar of Texas."

This is only one of the programs of the controversial four-year public relations campaign of the State Bar of Texas. This campaign, funded by increased Bar membership dues, cost the State Bar \$268,496 for the year ending May 31, 1972. This cost came out of a General Fund expenditure of \$940,250. (35 Texas Bar Journal 820). This is to be compared with a public relations expenditure of \$176,593 in 1970-71 (34 Texas Bar Journal 701) and only \$10,248 in 1969-70 (33 Texas Bar Journal 638).

This rather expensive public relations program not only includes billboard advertising, but also TV documentaries, various pamphlets, a monthly newsletter, radio and TV public service spots, and a 30-minute color film, "Liberty and Justice for All" (made at a cost of over \$150,000). The purported purpose of this program is to "improve public opinion of the legal profession, and to preserve the adversary system of justice and the right to trial by jury." (35 Texas Bar Journal 100). However, when one takes a sober look at the program perhaps some other motives can be seen.

What spawned this ambitious public relations program were the results of the first in-depth bar attitudinal study made for the State Bar since 1952. The 420 page work, completed in October 1970, was a random sample poll in which five categories of respondents were chosen; general public, legal community, lawyers, other counselors (ministers, bankers, businessmen, etc.) and communications people. The survey, discussed in 34 Texas Bar Journal 13, 105, 208 and 304, found that approximately 20% of all Texans 17 years of age and older has a less than favorable attitude toward lawyers. Another 20% have a neutral opinion. The respondents as a group found lawyers ranked highest in regards to community leadership ability, with bankers, ministers, businessmen and medical doctors in descending order. In regard to time actually given to community service, however, the sum of all respondents ranked ministers highest in time given and placed lawyers next to lowest. The lawyers, though, though they were the highest.

In another survey, which determined a precise estimated value of time contributed by the members of the Texas Bar to public service activities, it was found that members of the State Bar devote 39 million dollars worth of their time each year to the handling of cases to which they were appointed by courts located in Texas (51.4% of the general public thought lawyers are paid their normal fees when appointed to defend an indigent); 29 million dollars of their time to doing free legal work for worthy organizations; and an estimated 68 million to civic and community projects. The total of free (Cont'd. Page 3)

LEGAL CLINIC AIDS IN CHANGES

The SMU Legal Clinic has been instrumental in bringing about a change in the Dallas Independent School District's rules relating to student discipline.

In a lawsuit filed last spring by Professor Charles Morris on behalf of a black 16-year old student who had been suspended indefinitely for allegedly cursing a teacher and an assistant principal, the constitutionality of her suspension without a prior hearing was questioned.

The suit was heard by Federal District Court Judge William M. Taylor Jr., who denied the application for temporary injunction, which would have reinstated the student.

Professor Morris, assisted by Jerry Siegmeyer of the Legal Clinic, appealed Judge Taylor's ruling to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, which issued a temporary injunction putting the student back in school pending disposition of the appeal. About this time, two more suits questioning the District's suspension policies were filed by Dallas Legal Services.

This past summer, after oral arguments, the Fifth Circuit judges sent the case back to trial court to determine the question of mootness, for by that time the suspension order had expired of its own terms.

Apparently as a result of these suits, the school district has now changed its policies. Effective this year, students now have an opportunity for hearings in all suspensions exceeding three days. The school district has also made (Cont'd. Page 2)

(Cont'd from Page 1 - CLINIC)

several other due process reforms which had been pointed out as needed in the Clinic's suspension lawsuit. Principals now have an obligation to follow procedural due process when taking disciplinary action against students. In suspensions of more than three days, the school district now provides for written notification to parents or guardians of all charges against the pupil; the opportunity for a prior hearing or conference during the initial three day suspension period; and notification to the parent or guardian that an adult person may assist the student in the proceedings, present his side, and question witnesses. If a school principal wishes to suspend a student for a period longer than ten days, a "third party hearing" before the district's Associate Superintendent for School Operations is provided. In addition to provisions governing 3-10 day suspensions, several other rules have been established. The rules in "third party hearings" provide guidelines for the hearing and provision for necessary equipment to tape the proceedings and set up the standards for determining the situations and charges for which a student may be suspended for a period longer than ten days.

FORUM: Barefoot Blasts Opponent

Campaign '72 came to Lawyer's Inn Thursday, Oct. 12 in the person of Barefoot Sanders. A large audience composed of law students, faculty, and staff members heard Sanders, the Democratic nominee for Senator, blast his opponent as "a man who would repeal the present and veto the future."

After explaining the origin of his name (Barefoot was his grandmother's maiden name), Sanders attacked Senator Tower's absenteeism in the U.S. Senate. Sanders pointed out his opponent has been among the most frequently absent members of the Senate. Tower has been absent for the voting on foreign aid, social security, tax reform and crime control funds. Barefoot Sanders believes the job of Texas Senator
(Cont'd next column)

EDITORIAL...

The Moot Court Board is to be congratulated for the forthright action they have taken in the past several weeks. First, the Board adopted a Constitution and Bylaws that from our understanding are both effective and capable of being administered. Secondly, in direct fashion, the Board solicited new members, in anticipation of the increased demands from this year's first-year class. The list of candidates for the Board was impressive both in quality and in numbers, an indication of the continued upperclass interest in a quality program. The Board chose six new second-year members: Vin DeBiase, Chip Doss, Mark Ellison, Bob Roeder, Howard Rubin, and Travis Vanderpool. The Board has now turned to the matter of administering the moot court program, and we hope that, in the words of Don Meredith, the momentum has now shifted and the program and SMU are to benefit.

(Cont'd from previous column - FORUM)

should be full time.

To stress a difference between Sanders and his reactionary opponent, Barefoot explained Tower has either been absent or opposed to all consumer legislation. Sanders told the crowd he favors creation of an independent food and drug consumer protection agency. Sanders charged his opponent with taking more than \$10,000 for speaking engagements from various financial institutions which have legislative interests before the banking committee despite Tower's membership on this committee. Sanders opposes Tower's "Rent-a-Senator" plan as a matter of integrity.

After the formal speech, Sanders answered several questions from the audience. He told questioners he opposed federal gun registration, federal action on marijuana laws and federal legislation on abortion.

While Sanders stated he supports the candidates of the Democratic Party, he pointed out that he disagrees with McGovern's view on defense appropriation, cutting the space program and welfare reform. Sanders told the audience he agreed with McGovern on the need for full employment, environmental and consumer legislation, and ending tax discrimination against single persons.

Sanders told his audience he believes "the first job a Senator from Texas has is to support the President (Cont'd. Page 4)

THE ADVERSARY

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Editor-in-Chief Jay Carmichael
Editorial Board Richard Anderson, Bill Garner,
Howard Rubin
Managing Editor J. C. Labowitz
Advisor Asst. Dean Steve Dycus
Staff Contributors Lamar Smith

Published by the students of the Southern Methodist University School of Law, funded by the School of Law, and printed at Williams-Graham Lithographic Service and in the School of Law Print Shop by Howard Rife.

Letters from readers are encouraged and solicited. The Adversary is distributed on the first and third Wednesday of each month, and copy deadline is the second and fourth Wednesday of each month at noon. Views offered are not necessarily those of the paper.

Advertisements may be placed in the Adversary for \$2.00 per column inch and should be submitted to the Managing Editor in the form desired for publication.

The Adversary, SMU School of Law, Dallas, Texas 75222.

(Cont'd from Page 1 - P.R.)

services rendered by members of the State Bar is \$136 million annually, an average of \$6,881 per Bar member annually.

In view of the public's apparent ignorance of the Bar's large volume of community service work, perhaps a vast educational, public relations program can be justified to inform the general public and to improve the public understanding of the functions, duties and services of lawyers and the legal profession and to explain the role of lawyers in our society.

However, when the new President of the Texas Bar, stated on the "Presidents Page" of 35 Texas Bar Journal 765 that one of the goals of the Bar this year is to "Develop and work with local Bars on the use of ways to sell lawyers services to the public in our public affairs program," perhaps one ought to probe deeper into the actual purpose of the campaign.

The same survey that brought out the public's ignorance concerning the community contributions of the lawyer also indicated some areas of potential income for the Texas lawyer. For example, the study found that 40.7% of adult Texans have never used a lawyer. Only 40.1% of adult Texans (age 22 and older) who bought, leased or rented homes consulted a lawyer. Of those respondents involved in business partnerships, 35.4% use no written contractual agreements. When one considers these and similar facts, will a public relations program instead of educating the public, actually create more litigation and thereby eventually resulting in more income for attorneys? Would a vast public relations program such as this be nothing more than a disguised attempt at unethical practice of barratry as some critics hold? Note that the respondents in the poll agreed that Texas lawyers have a code of ethics, but the public thought that only two-thirds of Texas lawyers actually followed ethical practices.

Not only is there a question of ethics here, but there has also been argument that this is an offensive violation of the public's sensibilities through the use of unwarranted and uninvited use of outdoor, radio and TV advertising that intrudes into aspects of the public's business and private lives.

Couldn't the money now allocated for public relations be better spent by dealing with the fundamental causes for complaints by the public -- unethical and inadequate practice? It is true that a reasonable amount of money should be spent on public relations to use reasonable methods of educating the public about the functions of a lawyer in society, for example the continuation and broadening of legal education in public schools, the publication and distribution of pamphlets on variety of legal subjects of concern to the layman, etc. Compare the amount of money spent in 1971-72 for public relations to the amounts spent on those Texas Bar Committees trying to get at the basis of the public distrust of lawyers: Committee on Responsible Citizenship, \$1,596; Legal Services for the Indigent, in civil matters, \$1,596, in criminal matters, \$6 (six); Unauthorized Practice of Law, \$2,850; Grievance Committee, \$36,613.

There is no doubt that the current professional public relations program will be productive, but perhaps before the program enters into its second half some serious questions ought to be asked concerning its function. Is the program really increasing the public's awareness of the function of the lawyer or is it merely encouraging more legal business? Is it counterproductive in that it is offending the public's intelligence? Is the program really worth \$250,000 a year?

Bill Garner

SBA COMMITTEE REPORT

The function of the S.B.A. Social Committee is to plan and execute all Law School social functions, such as beer busts, dances and golf tournaments. Members of the committee are:

1. Jim Burtch - Chairman (691-4614)
2. Mac Gibson - Dances (522-7343)
3. Tom Cox - Golf Tournaments
4. Richard Hentzell-Law Week (369-7680)

Anyone who feels they are great at partying and would like to contribute their ability, please contact any of the above individuals or any member of the S.B.A. Jim Burtch.

Labor, Law & Lillian

To lay eyes on her schedule is to nominate her for a place in Profiles in Courage; to have her help is to get three days' extra sleep; to find her is to unravel the Gordian Knot.

Her name is Lillian Blair, the Law School's Placement Director. She's halfway through the room posted "Dean, School of Law" (which is across from the placement bulletin board), up a set of stairs so narrow that Twiggy would have to side-step, and then somewhere in front of you.

Mrs. Blair's office is the laboratory that fuses students and jobs. Her lists of full and part-time jobs are available to both students and graduates of SMU Law. Job openings are described on note cards on the placement bulletin board. Each card has a number which, if recited to Mrs. Blair, will yield the name of the firm or company making the offer and probably an accompanying letter with additional information.

The reason for the absence of the firms' names on the cards and the consequent number system is to limit job opportunities to SMU Law Schoolers only. It is rumored that otherwise, after the Cotton Bowl and Neiman-Marcus, the bulletin board would become the major attraction for second and third year students from other law schools.

For Mrs. Blair, September and October are the most toilsome months. She schedules student interviews with up to three law firms a day, reminds the forgetful to ready their resumes' (to the extent of calling them at 7:00 a.m.), fields questions and wears smooth the edges of job description lists. Mrs. Blair emphasizes that almost half of the firms interviewing at SMU do not restrict their interviews to students with certain grade point averages.

Not all firms willing to add an extra desk make an effort to write letters to law schools. If a student is looking for a job in a particular city or area, Mrs. Blair can proffer the names of SMU Law (Cont'd. Page 4)

(Cont'd. from Page 3 - LILLIAN

alumni and their firms in that locale. Who knows what influence alumni might wield?

Or what powers of purse. Last summer a man who had completed one year at SMU Law twenty years ago called Mrs. Blair and asked if he could pay a student to do some research. Mrs. Blair put the man in contact with a student. The next day she received three dozen roses from the caller. And soon after that she learned that the man had paid the student \$100 for a couple of hours work. Whether she puts you in touch with such a spender or not, however, Mrs. Blair is a person worth talking to about jobs.

Lamar Smith

(Cont'd. from Page 2 - FORUM)
when he is right and oppose him when he is wrong - no matter what party he belongs to." Unlike his opponent, when elected Barefoot Sanders will vote for what he believes is the mainstream of Texas political needs and philosophy.

Don Adams

OPINION: GOLF?

After last year's roaring success, this fall's SBA Golf Tournament seemed like another Bay of Pigs. Catering to what the SBA thought was sufficient student interest in a fall tournament (the match is usually held in the spring), the SBA allocated about \$300 for the classic. Fortunately, only \$100 was spent. Unfortunately, only about 30 people came across the city to the Eastern Hills Country Club for the challenge.

Everything went wrong. The tournament had been postponed a week because the greens were all torn up. Well, some of the greens were as high as the fairways a week later. It's bad when one has to use a three iron to putt on a green. There were over 100 people signed up for the original date. (Cont'd. p. 5)

Dallas Bar Opens Doors

Through the cooperation of Henry D. Schlinger, President of the Dallas Bar Association, and John L. Estes, President-Elect, the Dallas Bar plans to open its committee meetings to attendance by interested SMU Law students. Bill Hayward and Larry Vineyard, co-chairmen of the SBA Dallas Bar Committee, will co-ordinate the efforts of the SBA and the Dallas Bar to place law students with the committees in which they are interested.

Following are brief descriptions of the Dallas Bar committees which will be open to law students. Later this month Pres. Schlinger and Pres.-Elect Estes will come to the Law School to further elucidate the functions of the Bar committees and to answer any questions which you may have. All law students are encouraged to contact either Bill Hayward or Larry Vineyard if interested in attending the meetings of and working with a particular Bar committee. The amount of active participation by a student will depend on the amount and type of work to be done, the student's interest, and the committee chairman's decision as to what the student can do on the committee.

The following list of Bar committees is not exclusive but contains only those committees which it is believed will be of interest or benefit to law students.

- AVIATION AND SPACE - deals with air law and has been working as a collateral arm of the Chamber of Commerce on air law and transportation.
- BAR ACTIVITIES - writes annual report to ABA; good insight into workings of every Bar committee and the Bar as a whole.
- CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION - selects topics and speakers for weekly clinics (each Friday) on trends, innovations, and problems in the legal profession.
- COURTHOUSE - concerned with problems of the physical plant utilized by the legal profession (courthouses).
- CRIMINAL JUSTICE - wrestles with problems of criminal justice in all its aspects in Dallas County.
- ECONOMICS OF THE PROFESSION - studies problems of economics related to the law and its practice; studied minimum fee schedule; sponsors program at El Centro to train para-professionals in law.
- ENVIRONMENTAL - makes recommendations to the city and proposes new legislation pertaining to environmental law.
- INTER-PROFESSION RELATIONS - concerned with relationships and conflicts between lawyers, accountants, businessmen, realtors, doctors, etc.
- JUDICIARY - conducts Bar poll; covers all aspects dealing with judges; works toward getting new courts if needed.
- LAW DAY - working committee which arranges Law Day program and supplies speakers to public schools.
- LAW IN A CHANGING SOCIETY - works in cooperation with Dallas Independent School District to teach law in Dallas Schools through Socratic approach; reaches 20,000 students and has attained national recognition; work under way to make this a state-wide project.
- LAWYER REFERRAL SERVICE - public service project; committee plans study of entire referral program.
- LEGAL AID AND LEGAL SERVICES - works with Dallas Legal Services
- PRE-TRIAL RELEASE - works with program of pre-trial release for 300+ persons each month.
- PUBLIC RELATIONS - very busy
- UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE - investigation and prosecution of people practicing law without certification.
- URBAN AFFAIRS - works to determine how the Bar can actively serve the community; implementation of proposed ideas.

Students who are interested in working on these committees will be placed with a committee beginning in February 1973. Committee assignments are for the calendar year.

Jay Carmichael
Bill Garner

OPINION: Further Frustration!?

(Cont'd. from Page 4 - GOLF)

Dean Galvin had a discussion with the first-year students two weeks ago, in which he set forth several axioms of Law School life that do not seem to this writer to completely state the situation as it exists. Members of the first-year class met with the Dean to discuss their reactions to the first 2 months of their law school experience, and the students were very frank in their frustration and concern. One student told the Dean that he (the student) was concerned about the overwhelming class size and student/professor ratio that he felt was detrimental to his education. The Dean replied that "we are diligently working to add new faculty." While this statement is entirely true, the effect was to indicate that a concerted effort was underway to reduce class size, lower the student/faculty ratio, and thereby improve the education offered. The facts of the past several years simply do not substantiate this impression fostered in that meeting. While new faculty have been added in the past 2 years, undeniably more full-time faculty have left SMU than have been added, and a perusal of the catalogs of the past several years will show this clearly. While SMU has added 50% more students in 3 years, the number of full-time faculty has declined. Professors of the stature of Eugene Smith, for example, have simply not been replaced. As a result, professors such as Charles Morris teach first-year students and downtown attorneys taught Procedure last year and teach Business Associations this year. While first-year students benefit from Mr. Morris, that is one less upper division course he can teach. The implications of another freshman class of 280+ replacing a graduating class of 140 after this year are staggering, since the faculty size is not increasing proportionate to the increased student population.

Later at the same meeting with the first-year students, Dean Galvin heard great frustration voiced by the students regarding the entire first year process. He assured them that this frustration was not a new phenomenon, that previous classes had said the same things, and "if you can come up with an alternative, legal educators will snap it up in a minute." Such may be the case in legal education as a whole, but not much snapping has been done at SMU. Alternatives have been presented, at SMU and elsewhere, and in some places they have been implemented. Georgetown, for example, gives grades for first-year work, but those grades are not entered on an individual's official records and do not count on his upperclass gradepoint. Whether or not SMU actually implements this or any plan is not the issue, however. The impression given by such a statement is that (1) there is an ongoing study being made by the Law School Community of the entire first year situation, in light of the outcry for change year after year after year, and (2) constructive change, when proposed, is openly discussed by all members of the community and carefully considered. Once again, this is not substantiated by fact. No organized study is ongoing by the Law School community of what is actually wrong or right with the first year, such that change can be studied in light of the opinions of all those involved. The Curriculum Committee is undertaking some investigation of various alternatives put forth by other schools, but at this time it is not known whether these alternatives will be discussed in a well-publicized, open hearing with the Law School community participating. The first-year students might be interested in knowing that in April of this year, the Curriculum Committee presented a carefully-considered proposal for revamping the first year to the faculty, which promptly moved to table the proposal. Thus, the frustration felt by this year's first-year class is only compounded upon that of last year's class in the same situation...

J. C. Labowitz

LAW WIVES TAKE NOTE: Mark your calendars on Saturday, November 11, at 7:00 p.m. . . . Hayride for paid members of Law Wives.

After the postponement the same sign-up lists were used without inquiring into whether the new date was inconvenient. Obviously it was.

The practice exams for the first year students and the increase in the work load for other students were not taken into account in the planning of the event. Probably the most incredible thing was that nobody seemed to sense the impending doom and cancel the tournament.

After the tournament some players were allowed to take home some food that could not be sold back to the distributors. Also, no trophy was provided for the winner or other places. Instead the winners were given money and told to buy trophies.

Looking on the brighter side, the winners were Carlos Ryerson and Mark Bader. They each shot 82's. Biff Godfrey was the last place finisher (a prize was provided for this achievement) as he shot a 134. He also managed to get stuck in mud up to his knees around a dried up lake and had to be rescued by his partner. By the way, this writer shot a 111.

The SBA should have a little bit better coordination of this event. After all, it's one of the national pastimes of lawyers everywhere. More important, it was one of the great successes in the past in providing relaxation to the harried SMU law student. Howard Rubin.

Athletic Academics

As surely as night follows day, basketball 1ms are upon the athletic academics now that football has passed into history. As predicted in these pages, this season could be described as (if nothing else) a real sleeper.

The second-year CeeBees heaped glory upon the Law School by sweeping the grad league, humbling the independent champs 28-6, and throwing down a show-down challenge to the frat champs. Featuring a crushing line, strong defense, and a classic debate style over (Cont'd. Page 6)

(Cont'd from Page 5 - ATHLETICS)

officials' calls, the CeeBees rate a number 1 rating in the final polls.

The final grad league standings saw the CeeBees on top at 7-0, followed by Law II (4-3), Lawyers Inn (3-4), Law I (2-5) and Law III going out as it came in at 0-7. Not counted in the standings are two losses to Baylor Hospital: Reed Prospere's spleen and kidney, plus Russ Cone's retina.

Not content to rest on laurels (but almost anything else), the collective attention turns to basketball. Another imposing lineup represents the Law School. Preseason Number 1 pick has to be Lawyers Inn A, with Freeman, Christian, and the gypsy jock, Jeff Davis. Lawyers Inn checks in with a B and a C team as well. Law I should field a running team, and Law III is talking basketball, but actually getting a team together is something else. Second year is represented by an as-yet-unnamed group of veterans who should score a couple, anyway.

J.C. Labowitz

(Cont'd.- HOW IN ARE YOU)

18. Give yourself 2 points for every Social Security number that you have memorized, other than your own.
19. Give yourself 5 points for going in a group of not less than six people to Kubys for lunch exactly at noon.
20. Give yourself 2 points for studying in the faculty library.
21. Give yourself 2 points for each time you make an announcement before class.
22. Give yourself 3 points for knowing where the Placement office is.
23. Give yourself 5 points for graduating from SMU and becoming a corporate lawyer in Dallas.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The International Moot Court problem is now available in Dean Anderson's office. The SMU competition will be held on Nov. 20. There will be individual competition with 2-5 people being chosen to go to the regional contest.

How "In" Are You?

Here we go again, contest fans. Your response to our first contest was overwhelming. Auntie Adversary was up to the wee hours of the morning getting her jollies reading all of the answers. By the way, the winner of that contest was Professor Scott Morris who not only answered all the trivia, but mentioned trivia that nobody could know about this Law School. He also criticized us for not being serious students and told us that when some "stupid client" comes into our office, we would probably go to a joke book instead of a Reporter. Anyway, congrats, Scooter.

Today's contest concerns how "in" you are. Do you do things that make you one of the "beautiful people" of the Law School? Well, here's your chance to find out. Using the predictability scale of the LSAT and the grading technique of Colonel Harding, we have devised a test that will enable you to find out whether you are a successful law student (remember, being a successful law student is not the same as being a successful lawyer!). Just add or subtract the indicated number of points for the activities in which you participate. After you come to your total, divide it by the number of questions on a Bill Flittie exam and add the number of holes in the walls in Storey Hall. Then subtract the number of good looking undergraduate girls who study in Underwood Library on any given night. If you score over 100 points be sure to indicate it on your resume'. If you score over 200 points, you will be invited to the Barristers. If you have a negative score, sit in the corner of Jean Jury's office for one week. Here we go:

1. Give yourself 1 point for each time you dress up to go to class so that you can show everybody that you have a job downtown or are going for an interview.
2. Give yourself 1 point for each time you walk up and down the West stairs of Storey hall so that you make everyone think you are on law review when in actuality you're not.
3. Give yourself 5 points if you are in a discussion and coffee group which meets in Lawyers Inn between 9 and 11 a.m. You get an additional 2 points if you sit in the group to the left of the entrance to the lobby or the group that meets around the round table.
4. Give yourself 5 points if you watch Walter Cronkite in the Lawyers Inn TV room 3 out of 5 days.
5. Give yourself 1 point for asking a question in class.
6. Subtract 1 point if you are Jay Carmichael, Mark Bader, or Robert Rose asking a question.
7. Give yourself 2 points if you know Rod Suratt's favorite baseball team.
8. Give yourself 5 points each time you are invited to the Dean's house and 2 points each time you go swimming over there.
9. Give yourself 2 points for every "downtown lawyer" you speak to for over 30 minutes.
10. Give yourself 2 points if you throw frisbees or putt golf balls in the halls of Lawyers Inn.
11. Subtract 5 points if you still go to your SMU Undergraduate fraternity's parties.
12. Give yourself 3 points for each Gilbert, can, or Hornet that you own.
13. Give yourself 1 point for each time you go up to talk to a professor after class about something that was mentioned in class, but add 5 points for each time you talk to him about something other than class discussion.
14. Give yourself 10 points for divorcing your wife upon graduation after she has paid for your education.
15. Subtract 5 points for being seen in public with Roy Anderson.
16. Subtract 50 points for being seen in public with Pete Bird.
17. Subtract 100 points for being seen in public praying for Pete Bird.

(Continued in left column)