INT'L. LAW SOC. NAMES
1968 MOOT COURT TEAM

The International Law Society of the Law Center has chosen its intercollegiate moot court team for 1968. Through a series of intramural oral arguments in the Philip C. Jessup International Law Competition Patrice Lyons '69, Laurence Singer '69, and Ralph Nickerson '69 were selected to represent Georgetown in competition this year. These winners were chosen on the basis of their oral presentation and written briefs submitted to a panel of judges consisting of Prof. Don Wallace, Prof. John H. Crabb, and the Hon. Stanley D. Metzger, formerly of the G.U. faculty and currently director of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Georgetown's team will compete with five other teams in the regional moot court arguments to commence on March 30 in Washington, D.C. Specifically, Georgetown will face American and George Washington Universities.

Unlike other moot court competitions, the student participants are allowed no outside assistance in preparing their arguments. The team which wins both of its regional arguments will be declared the regional champion. Should more than one team win, there will be a tie-breaker to determine the champion. 

The International Law Journal of the G.U.L.C. Names the 1968 MOOT COURT TEAM

In response to student requests, Associate Dean McCarthy held an open meeting on the tuition increase followed by a question and answer session. According to the Dean, the increase was in the making in January but was not authorized to make this information public. The actual decision was made by the Board of Directors of Georgetown University and their decision was communicated to the Law Center on Friday the 9th with instructions that it be published on the 10th. The reason for the increase — costs -- namely, Georgetown University's expenses and alumni contributions are completely inadequate to meet rising costs. The increase, according to Dean McCarthy indicated that the increase will be spent as follows:

- $33,000 30% increase for library expenses including increased numbers of student library assistants. Also $50,000 will be spent for new books and periodicals.
- $2600 11% increase for the Placement Service which will include expenses of re-decorating interview rooms suitable to the quality of people interviewing and being interviewed.
- $7300 78% increase in the Budget of Res Ipsa primarily to provide for new equipment and eight additional pages.
- $11,000 42% increase for the Law Journal budget. This will be spent for reprints of Journal articles and will provide for increased printing costs. Necessary because of Journal's reputation, this increase will be spent in direct operating costs. An additional $55,000 will be spent on indirect costs which include fringe benefit programs, payroll services provided by the University Administration, etc.
- $195,000 of the increase will be spent in direct operating costs.
- Total revenue anticipated from this year's tuition will amount to approximately $50,000. Dean McCarthy justified the need for this "cushion" in terms of:

1) uncertain enrollment and therefore uncertain revenue due to the draft problem.
2) inaccuracies which arise in every budget, no matter how well planned.
3) necessity of a reserve fund to meet emergencies such as price increases.

After Dean McCarthy's explanation of the why and whereof of the increase, he faced a barrage of questions from his audience. Student grievances centered primarily on the "lack of notice" issue and the issue of contributions by the Law Center to the general university administration fund.

Dean McCarthy maintained that the tuition should have been raised significantly long ago and then allowed to remain at a reasonable level. It was not so raised in the past because the Administration and Board of Directors are basically "humanitarian" in outlook and are sympathetic to the burdens this would impose on parents and students. However, necessity decreed that "humanitarian" feelings be overruled two years ago in a "now. The Law Center's tuition will still be below that charged by such schools as Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Penn, Columbia, etc., and the tuition increase will better Georgetown's competitive position with those schools in providing faculty, services, and education. Personally, Dean McCarthy felt that student should have been obtained on the question of the increase and he regretted that this was not done by the Budget Committee.

With the recent elimination of graduate student deferments, Georgetown has had to adjust its admissions thinking. Jack Fischer, head of the Law Center Director of Admissions, reports that he is sending out between twenty and thirty percent more acceptances to apply­ants, three new faculty members, enlarged curriculum. Also to secure secon­tary, legal research assistants, and recruiting and alumni activ­ities.

G.U.L.C. Admissions Adjusting In Face Of Draft Squeeze

In all, $195,000 of the increase will be spent in direct operating costs. An additional $55,000 will be spent on indirect costs which include fringe benefit programs, payroll services provided by the University Administration, etc. Together they account for $250,000 of the additional revenue to be raised by the tuition increase.

Total revenue anticipated from this year's tuition will amount to approximately $300,000. This figure is obtained from the number of full time students (816) and a translation of the number of credits taken per year by each graduate student into full time student terms, which would amount to approximately 256 full time student terms.

The total budget increase minus planned expenses leaves a residuum of approximately $50,000. Dean McCarthy justified the need for this "cushion" in terms of:

1) uncertain enrollment and therefore uncertain revenue due to the draft problem.
2) inaccuracies which arise in every budget, no matter how well planned.
3) necessity of a reserve fund to meet emergencies such as price increases.

In response to student requests, Associate Dean McCarthy held an open meeting on the tuition increase followed by a question and answer session. According to the Dean, the increase was in the making in January but was not authorized to make this information public. The actual decision was made by the Board of Directors of Georgetown University and their decision was communicated to the Law Center on Friday the 9th with instructions that it be published on the 10th. The reason for the increase — costs -- namely, Georgetown University's expenses and alumni contributions are completely inadequate to meet rising costs. The increase, according to Dean McCarthy indicated that the increase will be spent as follows:

- $33,000 30% increase for library expenses including increased numbers of student library assistants. Also $50,000 will be spent for new books and periodicals.
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3) necessity of a reserve fund to meet emergencies such as price increases.
The editorial in the last issue of the Weekly took the position that the recent increase in tuition appeared to be justified in light of the shortage of funds which has been plaguing the Law Center. We still adhere to that view.

What we do take exception with is the lack of foresight evidenced by those responsible for the increase. The manner in which the increase was carried out showed a total lack of concern with the interests of the students affected. One could be excused for thinking that was last year's experience and because this was the second increase in the neighborhood of $250, special attention would have been paid to the thoughts of those who were going to have to pay. Not so!

Sometime in January the Law School Administration learned that there was a possibility of a tuition increase as the University was still in financial straits in spite of the second increase. The manner in which the increase was carried out showed a total lack of concern for students which often returns to haunt a school years later when an administration wonders why its alumni continue to ignore the University.

Such a poor handling of public relations has caused, and rightly so, much embarrassment among a great number of students at the Law Center. It is precisely this lack of consideration for students which often returns to haunt a school years later when its alumni contributions are so low. This is something which the University Administration has not yet been able to grasp in spite of a succession of similar incidents. One can only surmise how long it will take!

This paternal and authoritarian attitude of the powers in control of University administration is also reflected by the pervasive secrecy surrounding the use of the tuition from the Law Center. Again the Law School Administration can only parrot the approved line that all monies come in control of University Administration is also reflected by the pervasive secrecy surrounding the use of the tuition from the Law Center. Again the Law School Administration can only parrot the approved line that all monies come
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In memory of Andrew H. Erdreich, George Washington University Law Class of 1969, who died unexpectedly in January of this year at the Washington Hospital Center, a Memorial Fund has been set up by his friends to provide an Annual Award to the Outstanding Debater Foughtenkeuper (Y.L.S.) of the Law School. Andy had been president of that high school's Forensic Society.

Those wishing to contribute may send donations to:
- The Andrew H. Erdreich Memorial Fund
  c/o Morton Berger
  East Bank—New Hamburg
  New York

TRIMESTER MODEL

Note: The following instructional hours are now allocated to the various first year courses: (The total hours shown includes the examination period.)(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructional Hours</th>
<th>Examination Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>90 hours</td>
<td>3 hours (3 hrs./week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>75 hours</td>
<td>2 hours (15 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
<td>2 hours (week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>2 hours (week)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
<td>2 hours (15 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice II</td>
<td>45 hours</td>
<td>3 hours (15 weeks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 1967-1968, this trimester would begin on November 17, 1967, the actual starting date this year. The trimester would begin on November 26 or later depending on the length of the commencement and the time required for the examinations. The trimester would end no later than March 16, 1968.

Classroom time extends over a full ten weeks.

TRIMESTER "A"

November 27-February 27, or thirteen and one-half weeks, including a two-week Christmas break, as now, and a one-week examination period for two examinations.

Contracts, 4 hours per week (course ends).

Procedure, 4 hours per week (course ends).

Property, 3 hours per week.

Criminal Justice, 2 hours per week.

TRIMESTER "B"

Note: The trimester is to begin on March 17, 1968, the actual starting date this year. The trimester would end on May 27, 1968, the actual ending date this year.

Note: The following instructional hours are now allocated to the various first year courses: (The total hours shown includes the examination period.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Instructional Hours</th>
<th>Examination Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torts, 4 hours per week (course ends)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>4 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>2 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>6 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice II</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scheduling may be on a one-hour or two-hour basis or a combination of these methods may be used. Saturdays may have to be used if space limitations demand. The model assumes that there will be three sections of the first year class and that courses will be weighted as now.

TRIMESTER "C"

Classroom time extends from Wed., March 6 to Thurs., May 16, with allowance for the Easter break.

Procedure, 8 hours per week

Property, 4 hours per week

Criminal Justice, 4 hours per week (for nine weeks)

Exam in Procedure May 15. Exam in Property May 12, and Exam in Criminal Justice II May 29.

No classes in Criminal Justice until second week.

The Spring break would begin after the Contracts examination and would extend until March 5.

Note: Scheduling may be on a one-hour or two-hour basis or a combination of these methods may be used. Saturdays may have to be used if space limitations demand. The model assumes that there will be three sections of the first year class and that courses will be weighted as now.

New Law Pros. Hired for '69 School Year

At this date three law professors were hired for teaching positions at the Law Center for the 1968-69 academic year. These include: Joseph Page, William A. Stannemaker, and Henry G. Meyer.

Mr. Page comes to Georgetown from the University of Denver College of Law where he has held the position of assistant professor of law since 1964. Mr. Page has written several law and non-legal articles in several noted publications. In the area of legal publication Mr. Page has contributed articles both of legal and non-legal content in several noted publications. In the area of non-legal publication Mr. Page has written several law and non-legal articles in the fields of damages and insurance, damages, workmen's compensation, etc.

Mr. Page has been hired as a member of the editorial staff of the New Law Review magazine. A friend of the controversial consumer's crusader, Ralph Nader, Mr. Page has also published an article in the November 27-February 27, 1967. Mr. Page has been hired as a member of the editorial staff of the New Law Review magazine. A friend of the controversial consumer's crusader, Ralph Nader, Mr. Page has also published an article in the November 27-February 27, 1967.
When the Supreme Court reconvenes Monday, March 11, 1968, it will deliver a number of important decisions and will hear oral arguments on a number of equally pressing issues. One interesting problem to be heard by the high court is that of community antenna television (CATV). Two cases will be argued; in the first, United Artists Television, Inc., by its president, Louis Nizer, inter alia, is trying to enjoin the Fortnightly Corporation, which has two smaller direct cables to television sets of individual subscribing households which currently pick up the major broadcasts from Pittsburgh, Wheeling, and other cities (133 F.D.2d 872), and other programs of audible reproduction of the motion picture. Defendant argues that it is not a copyright infringement because defendant's operation (which consists of a large coaxial cable from the central antenna and smaller direct cables to television sets of individual subscribing households which currently pick up the major broadcasts from Pittsburgh, Wheeling, and other cities) is non-infringing because defendant's operation has an "implied license" to do so. The argument might be characterized like this: the signals are in the air; the folks at home in the valleys can't 'em with their small antennas; the Federal Communications Act requires the FCC to "provide a mechanism to acquaint the student with clerkship opportunities for which he is qualified;" and the Law Center's reputation is enhanced by the success of those dual efforts.

The Committee, formed in 1960 to increase the scope and effectiveness of the traditional informal practice of recommendations made to judges by individual professors, serves a triple function. It operates as a mechanism to acquaint the student with clerkship opportunities for which he is qualified; it provides a welcome and now widely accepted screening service for judges seeking clerks; and the Law Center's reputation is enhanced by the success of those dual efforts.

Students requesting the Committee's assistance should rank high in their class and possess a proven ability for research and legal writing. Federal circuit court of appeals, some district courts and outstanding state courts look first to Law Journal members, but experience in Legal Aid, Most Court, and in writing research memoranda for professors also carries valuable weight. The Committee has requested that interested students expecting to graduate in June of 1968 submit full resumes to Professor Cohn's office by September 1, 1968. Early applications to the courts are strongly suggested. Upon notification of application, and subsequent to interviews, the Committee may follow the application with a letter of recommendation.

Other positions in the courts are available for part-time and summer work. Second-year men are eligible for night junior clerkships. These positions begin in June and are dependent upon the needs of the court, and specialization in particular areas is often stated as a prerequisite.

There are far fewer summer clerkships than annual junior clerkships as the courts usually handle only a light workload between May and September. In addition, judges tend to try to avoid adding summer help to the payroll as the time available is too short for the training necessary. However, summer clerkship experience could be an invaluable asset in making later application for a full clerkship. Although the Clerkship Committee is prevented by law from locating possible openings, it will send letters of recommendation.

Professor Dash will talk on "The Rights of Society versus The Rights of the Accused in the Administration of Criminal Justice—Is there a Conflict?" The purpose of the series is to highlight those areas of community living which give rise most frequently to competing legal interests and to study how deep a conflict there really is and if competing segments of society can be brought closer together within our legal framework. The lecture begins at 8:00 p.m. in John Carroll Auditorium. A special feature of the evening will be the installation of Professor Dash as an honorary brother of Tατ Chapter of Phi Alpha Delta. All students and faculty members are cordially invited to attend the lecture and reception which follows.
IN DEFENSE OF SPOON-FEEDING

George Parry

In general terms, a modern, formal legal education is structured to make the student the architect of knowledge of the major areas of discussion in legal theory and secondarily the content of the course methodology used in the researching and marshalling of the actual law. This method, in the case of legal theory, is at best, clumsy and time consuming. Consequently, a tendency is developing among the schools’ dual purposes. That is to say given a set period for the acquisition of a legal education, its use, thereby, must be focused upon. The time consuming study of case methodology necessarily limits the introduction to, and time devoted to, the study of legal theory to be covered. Moreover, this tension is a function of the tendency toward separation of today’s law students and the broadened law school curriculum to include a major course in legal theory. Thus, as more avenues of inquiry into the nature of legal theory are opened to the student, he is forced to ask at what point along the line of tension does the case method cease to be a per se learning exercise (i.e. when is a working knowledge of case methodology acquired) and instead become a hindrance to the other basic purpose of legal education?

To answer this question, a normative one, must be made. If it is decided that at the end of the first year the law student still lacks the ability to analyze cases, then it would appear that continued use of the case method is ineffective. That the study of law is a repetitive exercise somewhat akin to the teaching of torts to the student each year he is in school. If it is decided that at the end of the first year the student still lacks the ability to adequately analyze cases, then a weighing must be made of the importance to the student of obtaining a wider grasp of legal theory relative to the adequate learning of the case method while still in school.

A basis in legal theory is important to the student in that it gives him a skeleton of legal knowledge which can be expanded upon by the student himself in his studies for the bar or his practice. It is a framework against which case decisions must be analyzed. It is possible that the student is encouraged to take certain courses so he will have a theoretical background against which to analyze the law in order that he be able to pass the bar. Furthermore, while the student may have learned some of the great many areas of legal theory appear to be rare outside law school, the same cannot be said for the consideration of the case method. As the basic tool of the attorney and judge, the case method would seem to be consistent before the student and continuously scrutinize its mastering as it appears to be had at any time in the course of a legal career.

Thus far, the case method and the teaching method have been treated as dual goals of legal education. There is another view of legal education which holds that there is but one pre-eminent goal to law school and that is to teach students how to think precisely. To this end the case method is held to be indispensable. The advocates of this view argue that the case method of study has a built-in precision in setting forth the practical applicability of legal theory. This is the classic concept of legal education. The student sharpens his mind by pouring over a great number of cases and considering the possible alternative courses of action that are available when certain situations while simultaneously distilling the broad legal questions facing the law student. This is the reason case law is raised in the cases. But, conceptually speaking, before the student can analyze a case properly, he must know the parameters of the problem area being treated. Thus a working knowledge of legal theory is necessary. If the student is analogous to a tyro the game of golf by handing him the ball, telling him to study it and consider what can be done with it, pointing out that it is a difficult game to play, and then introducing him in subsequent lessons to the club, then the case method would seem to be constantly before the student and consequently its mastering may apparently be had at any time in the course of a legal career.

In summation Mr. Rutledge pointed out that a coordinated effort of law students in the welfare rights area would be of immense value in making Congress deal with welfare recipients in a more equitable manner than it did last session.

Tuition Petition Presented to Deans

In response to the unexpected petition from a group of second year students there have circulated a petition which expresses disagreement with the increase in tuition in the manner in which it was handled. Specifically, the petition was brought into the Dean’s office immediately after the negative vote with the idea that there would be some re-division for those students who have not already paid. It was hoped for the second time two years running. If this would not be possible, the petitioners have requested that the fees be given loans to cover the increased amounts.

The second proposal that the petitioners made was for the implementation of a contract whereby entering students would know the cost of tuition in their first quarter. This would mean that any increase in tuition would only be applied to entering students and not to those already enrolled.

The third area with which the petition dealt was the communication between the law school and the University Administration. The petition cited numerous points of disagreement between the law center between the Administration and the University and it stated that it was needed to be better the relations with the Hilltop.

On Friday, February 23, Don Stern, John Wintrol and Steve Schuchman presented the petition to Dean Dear. Though the Dean was optimistic about any reduction in tuition because of the financial strictures in which the University was in, it was still stated that there was a definite room for improvement in communication between the law center and the University Administration.

In furtherance of the aims of the petition, students were scheduled to meet with Father Fitzgerald on Wednesday 28.

L.S.C.R.R.C. ESTABLISHES WELFARE FRONT WILL AID RECIPIENTS IN HEARINGS

On Thursday, February 15, Steve Rutledge, the Welfare Coordinator for the Law Student’s Civil Rights Research Council (LSCRC), spoke to the Georgetown LSCRC chapter on welfare and the law student in Washington, Mr. Rutledge stressed the need to develop a welfare rights movement of local origin and scope. Such a program would then be more responsive to the needs of Washington residents. With the increasing amount of legal resources being channeled resources through the national offices of the Poverty Rights Action Center, which currently administers the welfare rights effort, this local movement would engage workers to work directly with four local groups. Three of these groups are located in Southeast Washington and one in Northwest. To help organize the new program four Georgetown students were enlisted. These include: Betsy Singstad, Henry Diaz Sec. E. Class of 1971

Petition from Page 1)

immm, $150/year during his three years and therefore, he would be able to budget accordingly before entering school. Mr. McCarthy felt that students do not come to Georgetown because of its prestige. He felt that the University should not be in the tuition business and that there was a definite room for improvement in communication between the law center and the University Administration.

With reference to the Law Center’s contributions to the General University Administration Fund, the Dean stated that this is a fixed amount paid by the university which he is not authorized to reveal, but that in his opinion it is not significant and that a Law Center separately incorporated from the University would definitely not be advanced as to how much of the contributions of Law Center Alumni are contributed to the rest of the University. Dean McCarthy cited that the Law Center receives $40,000/year in alumni contributions in addition to the money which the Law Center’s programs and the building fund of the new school have received from the University and from alumni of the Georgetown undergraduate school who are not graduates of the Law Center.

Second year students seemed particularly concerned about the 43% increase which represents a 43% increase in their tuition over a (Continued on Page 6)
**HONOR FRATERNITY CONVENCES TO DRAFT NEW MEMBERS**

The present student members of Lambda Rho Theta National Honorary Law Fraternity, Inc. have invited new candidates to the Society to maintain a continuing membership.

**TO DRAFT NEW MEMBERS**

Edward George Casey, a graduate student at the Law Center died Sunday, February 25th, at Washington Hospital Center. Mr. Casey was a resident of Sault, Michigan, received his Bachelor of Law degree from Georgetown in 1966. At the time of his death he was employed by Morgan, Lewis and Bockius.

**ALPHA Chapter**

Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity held a luncheon at the Continental Hotel. The speaker, Dean George W. Cohn, engaged in a justification of the recent tuition increase and the circumstances surrounding it. No clouds of dust were raised or feathers ruffled and no one knew of the current increase until it was abrogated. This led to a discussion by the delegates that the student body is still in the dark about the budget of last year and that we ought to be apprised of where the money is going. So, the delegates passed a resolution asking the Administration to make public an itemization of the budget and also an itemization of where the Student Activities Fee is going. This is a very important question to me, is a question that has long been due for an answer.

**The Weekly Wants U**

(Tuition continued from Page 5) The second major part of the petition is that it asks the administration for some permanent machinery to insure that the surprise of this current increase is not to happen again. In brief, it asks for a louder student voice and more student consultation of the fiscal affairs of the Law Center. As is known, no one knew of the current increase until it was abrogated. The S.B.A. held a rather hurriedly called meeting last Wednesday to hear all about the petition to the Administration on the tuition increase. Although, as usual, the meeting was open to the entire student body, the attendance was very meager.

**Lively's Bar**

350 student signatures warranted a unanimous S.B.A. approval. But, as was pointed out by Frank Dubofsky, there are various other proposals that are of greater weight than the current one that was defeated.

**President Frank Dubofsky and Secretary Peter Hartogensis wait for something to happen at S.B.A. meeting.**

Finaly, there was a resolution, towards the end of the meeting that the student representatives go and report a student movement not to pay the proposed increase in tuition if the Administration is not forthcoming from the Administration. This was defeated, but its defeat was laid to its being too premature and not that it is beyond the realm of possibility.