Procedures For Who's Who Nomination Follow Old Plan

The Supreme Court to Hear Key Draft Case

Washington (CPS) — Next month the Supreme Court will hear a draft case that may affect hundreds of young men around the country, whose verdict will almost surely deal a blow to the Selective Service System and the procedures it has followed during recent months in reclassifying protesters.

In an unusual development for such cases, the defense, a 24-year-old divinity student, and the prosecution, attorneys in the Justice Department, have both recommended the same holding that the court of a lower court to uphold his reclassification to 1-A and his subsequent inductee activity — be reviewed.

The Justice Department, in recommending reversal, has collaborated with the Selective Service and its director, Lewis B. Hershey, who maintains that local boards have a right to reclassify "those who engage in illegal activities as delinquents — an action that puts them at the head of the list of priorities for induction."

The American Civil Liberties Union, which represents Oesterreich, is fighting the reclassification on several grounds, on several levels. It argues that:

1. The declaration of delinquency and reclassification in invalid because it is punitive and therefore cannot be undertaken without the due process safeguards to the registrant required by the Constitution (due process, presumption of innocence, and impartial trial) and so on.

2. That the act of returning a draft card is speech protected by the First Amendment. Evidence here, among other things, is the fact that in the original Selective Service Act of 1940, those persons who failed to register or to return their draft cards were subject to penalties.

3. The Justice Department brief, last week, admits that inconsistencies existed between the provisions for exemption (which) according to direction as "legal, illogical, and inoperative", and the provision for the registration process. The draft law requires registration and return of draft cards in order to establish the cause of the exemption.

It suggests, however, in each case as this one, where individuals have permanent exemptions, those exemptions may take precedence over the board's right to reclassify. Thus, the case would be reversed.
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To The Future—A Talk Out

As we went to press we were informed of a series of joint student-faculty meetings to discuss the future of the Baruch campus. While we have few details we understand that these meetings will be designed to involve the role of the student and many more areas of concern.

The first of these meetings is to be held Monday, October 8 at 4:00 p.m. in the Student Center. We hope that everyone who made the effort to attend both of the last few weeks will attend this one. There is a possibility that Peace, Yes, and Peace II, majors might receive a B.A. or B.S. degree instead of the B.B.A. degree. This may be possible for you to change your courses or take Liberal Arts courses never available before. The decision to consider students' views as well as arguments in favor of or against any action is a good sign that the university and administration are ready to meet the future with us—so we must be ready to meet them.

We hope that clubs will refrain from scheduling major events during the Talk Out, or even if they do, they should at least keep an open schedule for the next week. Remember that decisions reached in the Talk Out will affect Baruch and its public image for years to come.

Student Power—Baruch vs. Columbia

It is now apparent that the moves to solve the Columbia campus last spring may repeat. The items we now have and already Mark Rudd's and his SDS followers have disrupted the school. It is interesting to compare the announced goals of the Columbia students and their methods with Baruch.

While the present administration at Baruch, (remember our Upper Division Beret which saw less than one percent attendance) is now instead of force and violence we at Baruch have discovered that it is possible to sit down and discuss issues. It is in this manner that we have gained three student seats on the General Faculty and representation on all committees.

Of course not all of the credit for these gains belongs to the students, much of it must be shared with a Faculty and Administrator who were wise enough to accept the new role of the student.

Perhaps both sides at Columbia might benefit from a visit to Baruch.
Baruch Sports

By Larry Brooks

I'm back. Yes Baruch students, the fact is that I'm not only back but once again I'm raring to go.

To those of you who are entering freshmen and those with whom it has remained for the last few years, I say that we have the Chicago White Sox to win the American League pennant.

None of us are members of the Baruch School any longer, so we are in May. We know now that the Baruch School and the Downtown School are not the same institution. But there is one — a blatant one — that cannot be allowed to go unnoticed.

The College had (and has) a top-flight intercollegiate athletic program. And the shame of the last few years is that the apathy down here concerning City's teams was condemned because this was 'Downtown'. What nonsense.

Downtown, uptown, eastside, westside, this was City College. City College's teams were Downtown's teams, as well as they were Uptown's. Yet? The 1967-68 basketball team, the glamour team of the College — was captained by Downtown Richie Knel. The starting backcourt was made up of Downtowners Barry Gelber and Joe Mulvey. The sixth man was Downtown Richie Knel. The staffing backcourt was made up of Downtowners Barry Gelber and Joe Mulvey. The sixth man was Downtownner Marty Hutner. And Downtowner Stu Kessler saw considerable playing time.

As we were in May, we now belong to the Baruch College. As far as we know, there seems to be little difference within the walls of the institution. But there is one — a blatant one — that cannot be allowed to go unnoticed.

City College had (and has) a top-flight intercollegiate athletic program. And the shame of the last few years is that the apathy down here concerning City's teams was condemned because this was 'Downtown'. What nonsense.

Downtown, uptown, eastside, westside, this was City College. City College's teams were Downtown's teams, as well as they were Uptown's. Yet? The 1967-68 basketball team, the glamour team of the College — was captained by Downtown Richie Knel. The starting backcourt was made up of Downtowners Barry Gelber and Joe Mulvey. The sixth man was Downtownner Marty Hutner. And Downtowner Stu Kessler saw considerable playing time. Downtowners Jeff London, Joe Mulvey and Joe Gelber were starters, as well as downtowners Barry Gelber and Joe Mulvey. The sixth man was Downtownner Marty Hutner. And Downtowner Stu Kessler saw considerable playing time.

No, apathy reigns at this College because, in great part, materialism is practiced and preached at an alarming rate. No one seems to care that Baruch is part of City College. As far as we know, there seems to be little difference within the walls of the institution. But there is one — a blatant one — that cannot be allowed to go unnoticed.
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