Student Council Members Seek Improved Library and Schedule
Meeting Place of Council to be Changed

Following a week’s postponement of its regular monthly meeting due to the Christmas recess, the Student Council, at a session replete with spirited discussion, cleared up a heavy program of business, featuring administrative demands, extra-curricular activities, and a request for a new national sorority affiliation in the school.

Perhaps foremost in value of the evening’s deliberations, was the passing of a resolution requesting of the administrative authorities a change in the placement of books in the law school library. Mr. Rabinowitz, senior, after a detailed discussion, carried an amended resolution out of the Council that many members of that body recognized as a higher order of reference books, such as Corpus Juris, Shepard’s New Jersey Citations, New Jersey Statutes, American Law Reports and Law Reports Associated, are at present located in the alcove behind the librarian’s office on the main floor.

This, the speaker contended, caused great inconvenience and loss of time to students, in addition to the constant tax on the time of the librarian, usually a student studying with the New Jersey Reports in the balcony were forced to come down into the alcove to search for cases akin on facts and law. The secretary was instructed to request of the administrative authorities a replacement of these books in the proximate vicinity of the New Jersey Reports in the balcony.

Council members, after short deliberation, referred a communication from Iota Tau Tau, national women’s professional sorority, requesting the creation of a chapter in New Jersey Law School to Mr. Burns, chairman of the Student Affairs Committee. Mr. Burns will discuss organization with prominent women members of the senior class, who will, in turn, consult with the administration on final acceptance.

Intramural basketball, the bone of contention at the last Council meeting, was referred back to the organization with notice of a later discussion by the Student Affairs Committee.

On one subject of the evening’s discussion was the council practically of a single mind. This was the matter of the selection of a new meeting place for members of the Student Council. After an interview with the lack of satisfactory facilities in the law school proper, the committee, appointed specially at last meeting by President Flannigan, reported the selection of the Newark Athletic Club as the place of next meeting.

Roving Reporter Probes Reaction to Burns Decision
Much Publicized Rendition Case Inspires Strong Feeling in Students
Few cases of rendition have attained the spectacular notoriety of the case of Robert Burns. Advance publicity created by means of the theatre presentation and the newspaper articles. Our fugitive’s problem into every home and caused the hearing before Governor Moore to be the cynosure of the eyes of a nation. The Governor’s decision was received with favorable acclaim by the public but it also gave birth to innumerable and inventive in various sectors. The Barrister, in an endeavor to ascertain the conciseness of the student body’s opinion, conducted a representative interview and herewith publishes the results.

Robert Murphy of the senior class, a clerk in the office of Mr. Lane, who was retained as counsel for the State of Georgia in the Burns case. (Continued on Page 4)

King’s Bench Has Induction Dinner at Robert Treat

Fourteen Honor Students of Class of 1932 Are Initiated

On Thursday evening, December 15, King’s Bench Honorary Society tendered an induction dinner at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark to the recently elected members of the Class of 1932. In addition to the fourteen inductees, a goodly number of the older members were present to lend dignity to so momentous an occasion.

King’s Bench, it should be remembered, is the officially recognized scholastic honor society at New Jersey Law School. Each year, the society elects to its membership those persons in the graduating class who have proved their excellence in the pursuit of legal studies. To be eligible for membership, one must have graduated with honors.

The following members of the class of 1932 were given the membership scrolls and rosettes at the dinner: Maurice A. Rabinstein, ramus cum laude; Benjamin Gress, magna cum laude; and Jerome S. Lieb, Edith J. Lusin, Louis L. Schulman, David R. Harnell, Maria E. Cona, Donald S. Fuerth, Frank A. Headley, Joseph G. Mintz, Milton E. Heller, Robert T. Faltin, Walter M. Murphy, and Aaron B. Schoen, cum laude.

Following the induction ceremonies, the society listened to an address by one of its members, Irwin Lewis, a “fugitive” class of 1929, whose fugitive’s problem has become every home and caused the hearing before Governor Moore to be the cynosure of the eyes of a nation. The Governor’s decision was received with favorable acclaim by the public but it also gave birth to innumerable and inventive in various sectors. The Barrister, in an endeavor to ascertain the conciseness of the student body’s opinion, conducted a representative interview and herewith publishes the results.

Robert Murphy of the senior class, a clerk in the office of Mr. Lane, who was retained as counsel for the State of Georgia in the Burns case. (Continued on Page 4)

Plants for Merger with Rutgers Excites Concerted Protest from Dana Students

Counter Proposal for a University Holds Great Future for New Jersey Law School

A development of paramount importance now looms in the evolution of the New Jersey Law School; from an institution under private ownership and management it will soon become affiliated, according to word that the State College of Rutgers University or, as has been rumored, it will be one of the main units of a proposed University of Newark.

Announcement of plans to merge with Rutgers evoked a flood of student protest both in Dana and Seth Boyden. When dissected, this protest divides itself into two classifications; on the one side, it is the laudable expression of a pioneering spirit from a group of young people who fear the vigor of two young institutions will be dissipated in merging with a large established university and who are apprehensive that the individuality of a capable faculty will be lost in a general shuffle; on the other side, this protest assumes the character of the good old student “quack” which has characterized effervescent collegian spirits throughout history and which, in its most concrete expression, sends student and cop in the same ambulance to the hospital.

In this discussion, it is not intended that the note of protest should predominate. Its primary purpose is to propose and suggest to whomever it may concern a list of elements in a policy which may be summed up in the phrase—“Not a Bigger but a Better New Jersey Law School.” If we may be reasonably assured that the suggestions we are about to offer will form the basis of the new administration—Then We Shall Not Protest.

Our first, and probably most important, suggestion is that the financial policy of the new regime be so regulated that this school will be a strictly philanthropic institution with the eventual endowment as one of its main sources of revenue. We do not propose this as an insinuation to decrease the present tuition fee but as a prudent measure of the fact that the benefits of education are served, both as to faculty and student, when its costs are met through the medium of subsidization. With the profit and loss statement in the background, education suffers.

On the subject of endowments, it may well be said that they are chance offerings not subject to the control of the most enlightened financial policies in educational institutions. Indeed, in times like these, one must be rather bold to speak of them. Yet, in its almost twenty-five years of existence, the New Jersey Law School has granted degrees to several thousand lawyers and it is to be presumed, with the return of normal times, that a generous number among these graduates will give concrete support to a move to place the “old school” in the sun. With the passing of private ownership, the bar to such

(Continued on Page 2)
UNIVERSITY PROPOSAL

Contributions will be tax-deductible.

The University of Illinois is proposing to establish a new center for the study of religion and society. This center will be located on the campus of the university and will be open to all students and faculty members.

The center will focus on the relationship between religion and society, and will conduct research on a wide range of topics, including the role of religion in politics, economics, and culture. The center will also sponsor conferences and workshops, and will provide opportunities for graduate students to conduct research and to present their findings.

The center's activities will be supported by contributions from individuals and organizations. Contributions will be tax-deductible, and will be used to support the center's research and educational programs.

For more information about the center, or to make a contribution, please contact the University of Illinois Center for Religion and Society, 110 E. Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801.
In my humble submission, the decision by Governor Moove in the Burns case can most aptly be described by a single word: 'unfortunate'. The United States' Constitution delineates the duty of the executive authority of each of the several states, under the circumstances with which our Governor found himself confronted, to be as follows: 'A person charged in any State with Treason, Felony or other Crime, who shall escape from Justice, and be found in another State, shall be delivered up to be a state having jurisdiction of the crime.' It is to be noted that the constitutional provision does not say on whom the duty of surrender rests: this anomalous situation was remedied by a statute (see 5270 of the Revised Stat, sec. 662, Title 18, Crim. Code, U.S.A.C.P. 240) which imposes such duty on the executive authority of the state to which the fugitive has fled. From the foregoing it seems self-evident that extradition is a matter of constitutional mandate, and not of gubernatorial discretion, even though it be admitted that there is no way in which the mandate may be enforced. When Governor Moove was admitted to the Bar and, more important, when he took his oath of office as our chief executive, he swore to support this United States' Constitution; by what excuse can he ever condone his disregard of this clear and concrete mandate is beyond the scope of my imagination; I surely do not regard the unfortunate fact that he can not be compelled in a court of law to observe its terms as being of constitutional importance. His oath was to support the notable instrument as a whole, and was not restricted to those portions which he might be compelled by judicial order to obey.

"There are several other reasons for my attitude towards the Governor's decision. Briefly, I do not feel it to be the province of the executive to decide one state to pass in judgment on the penal systems of sister states: I consider that the refusal of the requested extradition was largely the result of misguided public opinion that, not the nature of the acts making up the crime, but the crime itself, was the basis of the proceedings which the crime alleged to be the yardstick by which the degree of punishment be asumed.