Tuition will go up $375 next year

Faculty salaries rise 8.25%, $250,000 in requests cut

by JO ANN SCOTT

The bottom line reached by the Finance Committee after six hours of deliberations Saturday was first and second-year day tuition of $3375 or $3380 per year and faculty salary increases of 8.12 percent. (table, page 3)

The committee agreed to let the class of 1977 "stagger on to graduation" as several committee members put it, with paying $300 less per year.

Evening division students will pay the same percentage increase as day division students. Graduate and summer rates will be close so evening rates as is possible without losing students. Student assistant salaries were frozen at $3.25 an hour for the previously proposed 25 percent per hour raise.

Dean McCarthy, who has the final responsibility for the budget he takes to the Board of Directors, will have to bridge the $52,935 deficit in the proposed budget. McCarthy commented near the end of the discussion, "I'll pretend to try to come up with a budget which matches your thinking. Please don't try to do any personal lobbying with me."

The committee voted 6:4 to let tuition go up to $3380 if necessary, but voted 6:4 against letting it go to $3385 or higher. McCarthy and Tom Metz will "fine tune" the budget to achieve a better balance, but McCarthy said he would probably still have to "tinker" with faculty salaries. Such tinkering could produce another 1/2 or 1 percent reduction in the academic increase.

The committee began on Saturday with a spread of 288.296 between projected income and approved outgo. Two main approaches emerged during the discussions.

One proposal would have balanced the budget by cutting the increases for the Institute, the C. C. Project and the Journal. The Institute of Criminal Law and the D. C. Project may bring in grant money which will bring U.S. C more in overhead recovery than the amounts Georgetown is being asked to fund. But if they don't get the grants, Georgetown would be devoting tuition money to groups which are not primarily involved with students.

Others felt that Georgetown should not cut its main research tools, but should raise tuition and fund the institutes. The faculty member coupled this with a proposal to leave and money at its present level, rather than increase it in proportion.

(continued on page 3)

FINANCE COMMITTEE...boosts tuition, cuts faculty pay raise

Tenure decisions spark controversy

by MORRISON CAIN

The first two of this year's tenure decisions have been made. The tenured faculty last week voted to recommend tenure for Associate Professor Heathcote "Peter" Wales; after two weeks of debate, the faculty declined to recommend tenure for Associate Professor Julian Kossov.

The Kossov decision was followed by a protest from students in his contracts course, who terms Kossov "an exceptional teacher...his dedication to teaching...and to his students is unquestionable." Kossov has announced that he will leave the Law Center at the end of this semester to accept a position with a Milwaukee law firm, although several faculty members are attempting to have the faculty reconsider its decision.

The votes were crucial for both Wales and Kossov since University regulations would foreclose their right to appeal if they did not receive tenure by the end of this year. The University's "five-year rule" requires that no un tenured full-time professor can teach here longer than five years. Wales came to the Law Center in 1971. Kossov joined the full-time faculty in 1969 after a year on the adjunct staff; the approximately two years he spent teaching in an exchange program in Ethiopia are not counted for tenure eligibility.

Both faculty votes were unusual in that they both overturned the recommendations of at least one advisory committee. The five faculty members of the Faculty Affairs Committee did not recommend tenure for either Wales or Kossov, while the five-student SBA advisory committee has recommended Kossov but not Wales.

The Wales recommendation goes first to the University-wide Rank and Tenure Committee, which usually follows the recommendation if it receives tenure to a Law Center faculty member despite a favorable recommendation from the law school faculty. The University President has the final decision on tenure recommendations.

Kossov would have to give his permission to a reconsideration vote here. Associate Dean Frank Fiallo stated the faculty then could, upon motion, decide whether a new vote should be taken. Procedures also allow a direct appeal to the University-wide committee.

Tenure recommendations are made on the basis of teaching ability, scholarly activities such as publications and legal work, and service to the University or the community.

One other faculty member, Professor Victor Kramer, comes under the five-year rule. A tenure note is scheduled for this Wednesday.
First-year class LSAT, GPA statistics released

by STAN LANDFAIR

An increase in quantity but a slight decrease in quality are the inferences to be drawn from the statistical profile of this year's entering class, recently released by Assistant Dean for Admissions David M. Wilks. This year's freshman class was drawn from a record field of 7077 applicants, an increase of 77 over the preceding year. The 559 selected for the full-time division represented 9% of 6164 day division applicants. The part-time division acceptance rate represented 13.8% of the pool of 906 applicants. While only 28% of all applicants were women (1990) and 8.7% were minority group members (621), the combined freshman class is 39% female and 20% minority.

Qualitative indicators, the LSAT and years of service, and persons designated by the Dean or President as special interest applicants...in making their decision, the Dean or the President shall consider the benefit to the Law Center as the deciding factor.

While LSAT scores and GPA's held fairly even for full-time and part-time students, those figures showed declines in most other categories. However, the median LSAT score for special interest students experienced a substantial increase of 20%.

Dean Wilks also revealed that a small number of students considered "disadvantaged" were also considered under separate criteria. This classification also included those non-minority and non-special interest candidates who are considered culturally/economically disadvantaged, i.e., children of first-generation immigrants or applicants from parts of Appalachia. Their overall statistics were 556(SAT) and 3.35 (GPA). The Law Center offered admission to 1793 candidates, including 502 were female. A waiting list was maintained throughout the admission season, starting with between 250 and 300 candidates and tapering off to about 40 in August. Of the 7077 applicants in 1975, 5099 were flatly rejected.

Council tables pot bill

by ALAN BRIGGS

Anyone who had expected pot paranoia to be on its way out in the next few weeks—forget it. The D. C. City Council two weeks ago voted 7-6 to table Bill 144 and probably put a damper on marijuana reform in the District for several years.

Keith Stroup, executive director of NORML, the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws, viewed the action philosophically. "We can give them the intellectual reasons for decriminalizing marijuana possession, but we lack the political clout to force them to do it."

Unfortunately, political clout is the name of the game. The circumstances surrounding the marijuana bill lead one to believe that "house rule" isn't quite all it's thought to be. It was supposed to be. All Congress had to do was threaten the District and it was all over.

Representative Charles C. Digs, chairman of the House District Committee, maintained that marijuana control was a federal issue. (Digs's committee had earlier said that real control in the District was a local issue, leading some observers to define the difference between local and federal issues in the terminology of the law involved.) The supporter of the marijuana bill may spell trouble for proposed gun control legislation before the City Council, since it is like pot reform receives much support in the District but will likely meet some substantial Congressional opposition.

City Council chairman Sterling Tucker, although voicing his personal support of the marijuana bill, said that the "politics of the situation" dictated the killing of the bill. Councilman Julius Hackett, Sr. disagreed. "Mr. Digs was not elected by the citizens of the District. The Council should stand on its own feet and not allow the House Committee to keep us in colonial status," Hackett maintained.

With talk on the Hill of the impact of decriminalization on Bicentennial celebrations, supporters of marijuana reform might wish to adopt marijuana's "colonial status." Marijuana was grown in Jamestown in 1766 and was not only legal but widely grown, by George Washington among others. Used medicinally, especially for menstrual cramps, the plant was a valuable source of rope and clothing. Marijuana didn't become illegal in any state until 1913 (California and Utah) and the first federal law wasn't until 1937, several years after the repeal of Prohibition.

Barring any change of heart by the City Council, marijuana-smoking D.C. residents who wish to celebrate the Bicentennial year without the threat of a jail term can either get drunk or go to Ohio. Some people might balk at calling that a choice.

GW law students sue for Agnew data

by JOSEPH ALLERHAND

The Justice Department, Attorney General Levi, and U.S. Attorney for Maryland Jervis Finney might all find themselves in contempt of court this week if Bruce Feder and Roy Baldwin have their way in Federal District court. For those of you who have stopped reading the newspapers in support of the pressmen strike at the Post, Federal Judges have found the third year law students at George Washington University Law School who are suing under the Freedom of Information Act for the release of material surrounding former Vice-president Agnew's resignation and his pleading of no contumacy to one count of income tax evasion.

The progress of the suit was steady, if tortuous. This past summer the two students sent a letter to the Justice Department requesting the release of the Agnew material under the Freedom of Information Act. Justice denied their request for disclosure citing exemptions in the statute which they claimed applied to the Agnew papers.

The students requested an administrative appeal of that decision but heard nothing in response to that request from the Department. Finally, after they filed disclosure motions in Federal court, the Justice Department took up the students' appeal of that decision but heard nothing in response to that request from the Department. Finally, after they filed disclosure motions in Federal court, the Justice Department took up the students' appeal of that decision but heard nothing in response to that request from the Department. Finally, after they filed disclosure motions in Federal court, the Justice Department took up the students' appeal of that decision but heard nothing in response to that request from the Department.

In an interview last week, I found both Feder and Baldwin disillusioned with Justice's handling or non-handling of Agnew case. Baldwin sees the Department's attempt to avoid disclosure as a blatant disregard for the Freedom of Information Act. The Act, Baldwin charges, "was designed to be a tool for the public...but the government still can't accept it that means what Congress wanted it to mean...they still feel they cannot disclose anything they damn well please." He added, "It's disillusioning to find out that this is the way the Justice Department treats you...you have to fight like hell to get anything."

Bruce Feder, a bit more soft-spoken than Baldwin, spoke to the necessity of "opening up the government to public disclosure" as one of the reasons he got involved in the suit, along with a desire "to get out of the worry towers and to stop chasing the-slimy buck." Feder characterized student and faculty reaction as positive and enthusiastic notwithstanding some students who questioned him on his views concerning spurious lawsuits.

The students have handled the litigation on their own with some outside help from private attorneys "to prevent gross errors." This effort has taken its toll. Coupled with their recently filed Motion for Sanctions was a request for a granting of non-compliance costs of up to $500. Speaking of the cost to the students of the government's non-compliance, Baldwin cited the time it took him to prepare the Motion for Sanctions: "It took me a whole weekend to work on that...I think they [from Decedent's Estates]."

The experience of both students has left them wondering how an ordinary citizen can hope to make use of such laws as the Freedom of Information Act when government agencies can use their superior resources "continuously delay, not comply, and not respond." They hope that Judge Green will approve sanctions and put an end to the "law and underhanded way in which we have been treated all along by Justice." I doubt that Attorney General Levi cares, but Roy Baldwin feels that "the Department of Justice should be ashamed of themselves."
Budget approaches rough balance

(continued from page 1)

tion to the tuition increase.

The committee eventually compromised by setting up a $15,000 fund to be used by the D.C. Project or the Institute for Criminal Law & Procedure if either group does not get its expected grant. The committee is hoping the foundations will see this $15,000 increase as a sufficient commitment by the University.

The Washington Star reported that the committee was "nicking-and-dining" the University to death in an effort to save students $39 a semester. Professor Bauman countered that a 2 percent faculty pay raise at $30,000 would be about $600 before taxes or around $400 after taxes and $57.50 a week. That ended the discussion of raising fees and macro economics.

The committee started with income from tuition, $15,589 from the Dahlgren endowment, $900 from psychological services and $20,500 parking revenues from the old law school to work with. They faced expenditures listed as "Uncontrollable (relatively) at this point." Which included an increase in non-academic salary and fringe benefits, a fringe benefit rate change, and an estimated increase overhead expenditures which included a contingency for university relations and the 1973 cost of a new security guard in the Law Center building. The finance committee did not vote on cutting these expenditures.

Twenty-six members of the faculty signed a memorandum to the finance committee, protesting any pay raise of less than 10 percent. The cover letter said that they had not asked the five faculty members of the finance committee to sign and had not been able to reach other faculty members.

The committee discussed, but voted against raising, parking fees. They were told application fees are probably as high as they can go without causing a drop off in applications and income.

The Finance Committee started with an estimated revenue shortfall of $288,296 before getting the cuts in the knife. Here are the cuts they made in budget requests in order to come within $32,395 of balancing the budget.

from the initial shortfall of $288,296

- 30,000 D.C. Project
- 41,000 library second-priority items
- 5,000 intern for D.C. Clinic
- 3,500 summer research stipend
- 5,000 pay summer faculty $1,450 instead of proposed $1,500; add six new courses to graduate school rather than cut
- 5,000 reduce present budget of Institute for Foreign Trade
- 9,180 Georgetown Law Journal ($5,000), Law and Policy ($3,678), and Barristers' Council ($512)
- 20,000 estimated overhead recovery
- 12,250 keep research assistants' hourly wage at $3.25 instead of proposed $3.25
- 7,211 keep library student assistants' hourly wage at $3.25
- 91,875 raise tuition to $3.375
- 11,800 give faculty 80% raise instead of proposed 9%
- 1,717 SBA cuts funding of student organizations at request of Finance Committee
- 15,000 merged fund for D.C. Project and Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure

leaving a deficit of $32,395 for Dean McCarthy to adjust

Admissions gossip: stick it in EAR

"We're all for Motherhood," a Georgetown public relations worker replied when asked about a recent Washington Star story. The Star printed an article in its gossip column, "The EAR," which stated that an applicant for admittance at GULC was rejected because she told admissions office interviewers that she didn't practice any method of birth control. The Georgetown public relations office, anticipating a widespread reaction to the article, began to research the reported incident.

The research was really unnecessary. The EAR is a rumor column in the Star from "unverified gossip" according to Debra Papier of the Star staff. Nothing is really checked, she explained. The items in The EAR are phoned in by anonymous tipsters or are submitted by Star reporters who come across some juicy tidbit that they can't use in their articles.

Star writers told The Weekly that the item would be impossible to verify, and that no staff writer had been able to locate the source of the story.

Could there be any truth to the EAR report? It appears unlikely. In the first place, admissions interviews are conducted only at the applicant's own request; interviewers have no bearing on admissions, according to admissions office personnel. They are intended to give information to the applicant, not extract it from them.

Secondly, a number of students knew or believe to be present were admitted last year. The Star subsequently printed an article rebutting its original article. Dean McCarthy decided to ignore both articles, according to fourth floor sources.

Let there be no doubts. Georgetown is "all for Motherhood." — by David Brown

Cash in on SBA trash-in contest

Prompted by ever-present mounds of trash in the student lounge, the SBA is running a contest to pick an appropriate slogan for an anti-trash campaign. The prize is a free beer or wine party (details below). The contest runs until Wednesday, Nov. 12.

"We're looking for some kind of catchy phrase to get the message across," said Kris Niedermeyer, chairperson of the Food Service Committee. "The lounge is really a men and needs student care to be kept clean."

According to Niedermeyer, both the University and the food service operators have a staff of workers assigned to keep the area clean, but they are unable to fight the accumulation. Last year, in an effort to restrain rising maintenance costs, the University physical plant department cut back janitorial staff and the frequency of cleanings. Together with the increased use of the new food service, this has resulted in a large trash problem.

"It's more than just aesthetics; it's money," says Niedermeyer. "If the students won't keep the place clean, then either Berger-Gordon has to or the University will. That means either higher prices or increased tuition."

All members of the GULC community are eligible to enter. Entries will be judged by the SBA Food Service Committee.

The prize is a free beer or wine party for the winner and ten friends in the Pub, the new refreshment facility under construction by Berger-Gordon. Contest forms and a box for entries are available near the food service counter.

CONTEST RULES

- Contest runs through Wednesday, November 12.
- Entry blanks are available by the food service counter.
- Include slogan, name, address, and phone number.
- Enter as often as you like. One winner will be chosen.
- The prize is a free beer or wine party for the winner and ten friends.

Vegematic chops up undergrads

Main campus basketballers were put on notice last Wednesday night that the Law Center is more than a force to be reckoned with, as the Amazing Vegematic, a team composed entirely of law students, made mincemeat of Macaroni and Cheese in the finals of the Early Bird Basketball Tournament. Playing before a light crowd in McDonough Gyn, the Vegematic outscored its opponent 32-27 to wrap up its fifth consecutive win in the single-elimination, university-wide tournament.

— by James Dougherty

SBA election results

The Student Bar Association held its fall House of Delegates election Wednesday, October 22, electing two delegates from each first-year section. A graduate division delegate, an at-large second-year representative, and an at-large delegate for a previously unannounced third-year day division opening were also elected.

Women in the elections were: Section 1, R. Nolan Davis and write-in candidate Robert Moses; Section 2, Ramona Powell and Angela Cameron; Section 3, Gerry Hawkins and Barry Macarontico; Section 4, Andrea Goin and Thaddaeus Bejar; and Section 7, Shelley Broderick and John Blazer. The second-year position was captured by Jens Sligh. David Lerner became the third-year delegate, and Lee Mingledoff took the graduate position.

Speakers program

The SBA Speaker Series, an effort to attract topical personalities to the Law Center for speaking engagements throughout the school year, is getting off to a slow start this year. An ad hoc committee was set up at the October 21 Student Bar Association meeting to seek out speakers and invite them to the Law Center, according to committee member Bill Worshen. By this time last year, 34 invitations had been sent out to prospective speakers, and the Series had gotten underway with an appearance by columnist Art Buchwald.

Worshen and committee members Andy Wolf and Bernard Gray are now asking plans for this year's program. They have about $1,500 in the Lecture Fund. Suggestions for prospective speakers are welcome at the SBA Office, Room 1B-48.
Tenure questions

Recent tenure decisions and the reactions they provoked (story page 1 and letter this page) underscore the need for the process to be as devoid of mystery and suspense as possible. There is a need for standardization of criteria for tenure decisions as well as for a more formal feedback method of informing untenured professors how their progress is being viewed by their colleagues. Unfortunately, a professor now often has no idea of where he stands until he is actually in the midst of the tenure process.

The five-member Faculty Affairs Committee has a heavy and difficult responsibility in making its recommendations to grant or deny tenure. Yet the responsibility of the rest of the tenured faculty, who must choose to follow or ignore those recommendations, is too often overlooked. Too few take the time and trouble to inform themselves in advance of the capabilities of those on whom they vote. When the general faculty chooses to familiarize themselves directly with the classroom performance, writings, and other accomplishments of tenure candidates, there will be more widespread understanding of and confidence in tenure decisions.

Tenure should not, of course, be turned into a popularity contest; total contribution to the law school must be the overriding goal. Yet it ought to be clear what weight will be given to student opinion. In the last two decisions, the student advisory committee's recommendations, based on class visitsations and student comments, were reversed by the general faculty. Some explanation is called for, if only to avoid the impression that student input is considered lightly or not at all.

The tenure committee can be a valuable forum for discussions on what direction GULC ought to take—should scholarly activity take precedence over classroom performance; should outside activities such as work on the Hill or in significant lawsuits be weighed as heavily as publications; should availability to students be a factor? The list could go on

While some aspects of the tenure process are sensitive, the nature of the process must be kept in the open. The system ought to treat each member equally. But if no one knows the rules, how can they be fairly applied?

Security answers

Security offices have been leaving this notice in unlocked offices and on unattended valuables. Now if we could only develop another card for locked offices, the latest target of our recent crime boom...

Dear Potential Victim.

If I were a thief, your office/room/valuables would have been stolen. A thief considers an unlocked door and unprotected valuables as an invitation to take what they desire!!

For your own safety and protection, ensure that your valuables and domicile is secured.

Georgetown University Protective Service.

Letters to the editor

Protest action on Kossos tenure

Dear Dean McCarthy:

We are distressed to learn of the decision to deny Professor Julian Kossos tenure. During the past weeks of learning Contracts from Professor Kossos, we have come to appreciate him as an exceptional teacher and a fundamentally decent human being. His dedication to teaching and to his students is unquestionable. Class sessions are enjoyable and instructive. We feel very fortunate to have Professor Kossos as a teacher.

Therefore, we are at a loss to understand the tenure decision's action against Professor Kossos. The school deserves an explanation. We, as his students, deserve an explanation. As best we can judge, the school would benefit from reconsideration of the decision. We understand that in their quest for prestige and reputation, the tenure faculty may benefit factors other than teaching ability important in (individual) decisions as to whether or not to enlarge their ranks. But is Professor Kossos no deficient in some other field that he is able to outweigh his great strengths as a teacher and as human being? Is his evening division degree perhaps insufficiently prestigious for a member of the tenure faculty?

Denial of tenure to Professor Kossos raises serious questions as to whether student opinion, expressed formally and informally, is to be heeded or, as appears to have been the case in this instance, simply dismissed by those who actually make the tenure decisions. These questions need to be explored and answered by the good of the school. But our most immediate concern is with Professor Kossos. At the very least he deserves to have this letter included among materials to be forwarded to other law schools that might have the good sense to try and benefit by Georgetown's mistake.

Justice Holmes once said, "our goal in life should be to do something first-rate and then to leave it undisturbed." Professor Kossos's accomplishments may not be advertised in scholarly journals. But they are known and appreciated by his students. The decision to deny Professor Kossos tenure reflects poorly on Georgetown. The real loss will be to the institution and to its students.

113 Members of the First-Year Evening Division Class

Hits Journal defender

To the Editor:

The Law Center is now confronting a serious challenge: whether to move in the direction of institutional racism or to maintain one of the last vestiges of non-discriminatory measurement. I am, of course, referring to the current controversy over instituting an affirmative action program to ensure that minority students are named in the Law Journal staff. A recent article by Bill Alshon summed up the case for naming minority students to the staff.

In the initial paragraph of his article, Mr. Alshon hit this case on two critical assertions:

1) whether the specific aspects of racism in which an affirmative action program responds exist in the regular process for selecting Law Journal members; and

2) whether any affirmative action program can in fact alleviate such racism in the selection process.

Unfortunately, Mr. Alshon neglected these issues in an appeal to the typical WASP's guilt pangs for past inequalities. As a result, the case for an affirmative action program is forgotten and neither of the key issues is supported.

In short, Mr. Alshon has failed to provide us with a cause for action (the need is clear) and has failed to outline the effect of the action (the solution issue).

Mr. Alshon concedes the case when he writes, "racism is not overt in the Law Center..." If racism is not overt in the Law Center (let alone the Law Journal), why should steps be taken to institute a program which by definition establishes racism here (discrimination against qualified non-minority group students)? However, even if racism exists at GULC, what does he have to do with the selection of members of the Law Journal? Mr. Alshon has neglected his burden.

In molding the issue, the advocate for affirmative action speaks as a large history of past injustices which allegedly hamper the achievement of minority students. Unfortunately, Mr. Alshon does not substantiate his assertions by referring to specific scholarly studies which have demonstrated that law students are in some manner handicapped by their race in efforts to be named to a law journal. Mr. Alshon does not even offer us a national statistic to indicate whether the absence of blacks on journal staffs is a peculiar characteristic of the Law Center or if this is typical of a problem in all law schools. However, even if he could produce the latter statistics, Mr. Alshon would still face the same fundamental problem—unless we change the current selection processes racism and what facts are available to support such contentions? A cause and effect relationship should be established.

In defense of the process of choosing (continued on page 6)

Security answers
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Commentary

International law weekend hits the heights and depths

by ANDREW ADAMS

"Up to the heavens and down to the depths"—the old saw about the common-law freehold became at least highly suggestive over the international law weekend of October 16th. Sponsored by the James Brown Scott International Law Society here, the weekend-long panels and meetings attracted a good many law students from out of town schools such as Villanova, NYU, the University of Baltimore, and the University of Connecticut. On Friday afternoon I pled in with Group Four, with visits scheduled at a law firm and at an agency, the dozen or so rove over to the Connecticut Avenue offices of the international law firm, Baker and McKenzie.

A small trip in a van, but a great leap for law students. The Chicago-based firm has branch offices not only in Washington, but all over the planet—London and Paris, match, but further down a list totaling twenty-two cities, Amsterdam, Rome, Canberra, Singapore... Founded twenty-five years ago, the firm makes a specialty of foreign trade, international tax planning, patents and trademarks, litigation, with a team of 350 partners and associates complemented by a network of correspondents, all working to assure, in over a dozen languages, the best representation possible for the corporate clientele.

The office decor of soft carpeting exuded the concrete glow of success. Even the window view went way above standard: the Ellipse and Monument, pastel buildings on the right showing through the trees, with the White House relegated (a nice touch) to the left foreground.

One of the partners, Walter Slowinski, gave the group more than an hour of his time, which was generous of him, or of his firm, or of somebody else. A man of obvious ability, not mock-modest in his references to President Johnson and visits to China, he undertook to describe what the firm did. What put in focus, however, one’s admiration for him and the firm were the attitudes of the corporate world he clearly reflected.

Take, for instance, the answer Slowinski had to a standard question about the role accorded to women in the firm. After referring to the six partners and forty associates currently working for them, he was encouraging. As illustration, he even mentioned a one-time occasion when a woman applicant was selected for an opening.

"I grudgingly... I was also given a telephone call to a partner in Tokyo which reached the mess at 3 a.m. Tokyo time... and a chickie (sic) answered. Enough.

On the issue of corporate responsibility in overseas countries, Slowinski offered the stock answer that a corporation could not, under pain of ejection, fight the local business standards, and so had to go along with the mores of the country. The mores argument, with South Africa and elsewhere, can only take you so far: what if the local mores tend towards converting Jews on a cor-

What courses would a top-flight international law firm like Baker and McKenzie recommend to those wanting to enter the field? Bread-and-butter courses: contracts, corporate transactions, none of this American Indian law stuff. The candidates for positions at B and M would have to be smart as pins and professionally ambitious, with "profes-

At the second stop of the weekend, the International Association of Human Rights Agencies, the director, John Davis, casually explained, "I’m the businessperson around here." Trouble was, the organization, which aided in the creation of commissions to enforce anti-discrimination laws, worked only within U.S. jurisdictions, without any international function whatever; in other words, it wouldn’t know something international if it ran across the room and bit it in the leg. You need a jurisdiction if you’re going to do good. Perhaps I was reading too much into the International Association’s title, but if they’re not addressing social and political injustice from Bangladesh to Berlin, what are they doing on an international law weekend?

We returned in the pouring rain. A poem from my property casework (yes, it has poetry) proved pertinent:

Your well fenced-out real estate of mind
No high flat of the normal citizen
Looks over, or train leaves behind

Pro feminis

Title IX and the woman athlete

by ROBERT MARSHALL

The greatest comment on the proposed Title IX regulations during the public comment period was drawn by the provisions on athletics. Educational institutions receiving Federal aid are prohibited from sex discrimination in interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics under the Title IX regulations. Separate teams segregated by sex are allowed if team selection is based on competitive skill or the sport is a contact sport. If there is a team in one sport for members of one sex, a member of the other sex must be allowed to try out for the team if there is no team in a similar sport for the other sex and athletic opportunities for members of the other sex have been limited in the past unless the sport is a contact sport. Contact sports are defined as sports the "purpose or major activity of which involves bodily contact." The sports of basketball, boxing, football, ice hockey, rugby and wrestling are specifically named as contact sports.

The rules on try-outs of members of the other sex and the inclusion of basketball in the ranks of contact sports leads to a curious result: Basketball has rules that discourage and limit body contact. This is in contrast to football, ice hockey, boxing, rugby and wrestling in which the rules encourage or require body contact. Thus the regulations currently in effect would allow a school to operate a large, prestigious, profit-making men’s basketball program without offering a comparable athletic opportunity for women. This has prompted some feminists to suggest the present regulations define contact sports as sports whose purpose or major activity involves either bodily contact or revenue production.

The express goal of the Title IX rules on athletics is to provide members of both sexes equal opportunity to participate. The regulations list a number of factors...
Letters (continued from page 4)
Journal selection plan discriminatory

Journal members is selective. Among students here at least nine out of every ten are not staff members. The Journal is discriminatory; it discriminates against those of us who are mediocre, lackadaisical, inept, and/or stuck somewhere other than in the top 8% of the class. Woe for those of us who did not make it into the Journal. Our careers are ruined and we have no excuse, such as an affirmative action program, to bail us out and give us a second shot at the golden meal ticket.

Mr. Atchison argues that "What is needed is a realization that a minority student is among the top 8% of those with similar cultural heritage has accomplished as much, if not more, than those normally selected on the basis of grades." What facts are available to support the assertion that a minority student necessarily achieves more when he accomplishes the same or slightly less than a non-minority student?

Mr. Atchison concedes into his defense of naming academically unqualified students to the Law Journal by citing the experience of U.C. (Berkeley) with a similar program. He asserts that the work of these minority students is indistinguishable from the work of other academically qualified students. If this is indeed the case, Mr. Atchison has made an effective argument for discouraging the present Journal selection process in its entirety, but he has not made a case for an affirmative action program.

Perhaps what we need is a lottery to decide who should be named to the Journal. One fears, however, that even such a system would be subject to charges of racism and calls for an affirmative action program. Relaying on a similarly spurious argument, advocates of such system would no doubt contend that it was discriminatory because it did not ensure that a certain percentage of minority students were named in the Journal. As laughable as this example is, it is not for lack of our current dilemma—be fail to address the same fundamental issue: how is Journal performance related to the selection process?

Name withheld by request

Remarked distorted

To the Editor:

Your October 28 article on the Sadat degree matter distorted the comments I made to your reporter. Quite the opposite of saying that my Committee had "a firm understanding that it would be consulted before honorary degrees were offered," I told your reporter that my Committee's role was purely advisory and that the University President and Board were free to decide upon honorary degree awards without consulting us. I did say that I was disappointed to learn of the proposed award through the newspaper, but that is quite different from challenging the University's right to proceed without consultation.

Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr.
Associate Dean (graduate school)

Uncritical, naive coverage

To the Editor:

The Law Week's, coverage of Israel's Supreme Court Justice Haim Cohn's recent extremely naive. That there were few hostile questions from audience might be related to the Administration's openly partisan stance, reflected by "the presence of GULC's 'security guards, both in and out of uniform", Dean Flegran's attempt to suppress leaflets critical of Israel, and Dean McCarthy's memorandum urging that Cohn be "honored" with "an enthusiastic student response."

Nevertheless, those who paid attention heard Cohn concede that an Israeli military commander may arbitrarily imprison and deprive of all rights any Arab or Israeli without binding judicial review; that marital and other legal rights of Israelis vary according to their official ethnic/religious status; and that Palestinian refugee property has mostly been "disposed of by third parties," i.e. stolen by Israelis. These admissions against interest are alone enough to explain why 70 United Nations member states condemn Zionism as a "form of racism."

One specific point merits following. As reported, when I asked Cohn about the Aminata concentration camp for families of suspected guerrillas, he not only "empathically denied" the charge—he even denied he'd ever heard of such a thing. I quote Professor Israel Shahak of Hebrew University, Chairman of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights: "Take the case of Abu Zemima, a concentration camp to which families including children and babies are sent... For the families of (Palestinian) guerrillas who were not caught, who were only suspects, (located) in the middle of the Sinai Desert." Adnan Amjad, ed., Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights (1973), pp. 50-51. This charge created an uproar when aired in Israel three years ago, and Cohn might be sincere in denying it, he couldn't possibly avoid hearing about it. Cohn himself, as a kindly, avuncular old gentleman—but I'm afraid he's a shameless liar. Although Cohn declined to answer the Legal Commentator of Israel, "your reporter took everything he said at face value, even adopting Cohn's partisan vocabulary ('terrorists' rather than guerrillas, 'traitors' rather than prisoners, and never call anyone a Palestinian). The political character of Cohn's presence—the ritual affirmation that, after all, Israel's just another state whose aggressions went unnoticed. Was this oversight also a political choice?

Bob Black '77

Nominates grad speaker

To the Editor:

Contrary to the impression law schools create, not all client problems are resolved in appellate courts. In fact, out in the "real world" most lawyers spend little time in court, even at the trial level. Since the majority of an attorney's time is devoted to avoiding costly litigation, it seems appropriate that the speaker at GULC's graduation should be an expert in the art of compromise and settlement. For this reason, I suggest the Hon. Kenneth Koistinen, chairman of labor negotiations, Federal Mediator William J. Ussery, be invited to address graduating seniors in May.

David Podolsky '76

Res Pendens

From the registrar

Pre-registration

Registration materials have been mailed. If you have not received your materials please come to the Registrar's Office. The deadline for submission of these materials is November 5th, there will be no exceptions.

Exam numbers

The Registrar's Office will shortly mail exam numbers to all students. If your address is incorrect, please put in a change at the Registrar's Office immediately.

Late hours

The Registrar's Office will be open until 8 P.M. on Monday, Nov. 3, to help students during Registration.

Pre-reg. corrections

First-year

Legal Research & Writing 418:005-07 is J credits, not 2. Note: For students who have already turned in their registration, the Registrar's Office will correct your forms.

Upper division Courses

1. S.E.C. Clinical Seminar 418:548-01 is J credits, not 2.
2. Your Oct 5 Seminar: Adjunct Professor Larry Simms will hold an open meeting on Monday, Nov. 3 from 11:30-12:30 in Room 1B-18 to discuss this seminar and answer any questions about it.

From the library

Help Wanted

Work-study preferred, but not essential. Help! Wanted immediately. Library

Meetings

Employment '76

The 11th Circuit Law Student Division will be sponsoring an employment conference for all 1st, 2nd, and 3rd-year law students. This conference will be November 8 and 9th at American University (Wood Circle Building). Registration forms can be picked up in the Student Activities Office (1B-51). Non-Law Student Division members can obtain a waiver of the registration fee by contacting either the Division Rep. Stan Land at 569-4247 or SBA President Tariq Kadiri. See the Division bulletin board on the 1B level for further information.

Women's basketball

Any woman interested in playing on a Law Center woman's intramural basketball team should leave her name and phone number in the SBA box in the Student Activities office by Wednesday, Nov. 5 care of Linda Morgan.

Law spouses

Mrs. Eve Grover, Manager of State National Bank in Bethesda, will discuss women's financial responsibilities at the general meeting of Law Spouses Society on Thursday, November 6 at 8:00 P.M. in the Fischl Lounge. The Bethesda Bank is run mainly by women and is particularly prepared to handle women's fiscal responsibilities. Some points Mrs. Grover will present will deal with credit and property ownership. All law spouses invited to attend.

Amateur radio

Georgetown's Amateur Radio Club (W1AFXJ) will meet Wednesday, Nov. 5 at 7:30 p.m. in the "Shack"—room B-25 in the basement of St. Mary's on the main Campus. New members are welcome.

From the SBA

Tenure comments

The Student Advisory Committee on Faculty Affairs is currently reviewing Professors Gustafson, Ritchie and Shulman's tenured status. Past and present students of these professors are asked to submit comments on their teaching abilities. All comments will be kept strictly confidential and should be put in the Faculty Af- fairs box in the Student Activities Office.

Et alia

Suggestion box

The Suggestion and Complaint box is located on the Second Street side of the B level, next to the Chemistry office. Relevant suggestions and complaints will be sent to office and department heads, and replies should be posted on the bulletin board within a few weeks.

Client counseling

The national competition for client counseling competition is once again under way. Teams of two students from each law school will compete regionally and nationally for cash prizes. If you and a friend who would like to form a team, contact Stan Landfair (569-4247) for further information. Registration deadline is November 24th. Cost of the registration fee can be assumed by the GULC Law Student Division.

Chinatown

"Chinatown" will be this week's Friday Afternoon Movie in the Mood Court Room. The movie will be shown at 1:30 and 4:30.

The Law Weekly welcomes contributions from all members of the Georgetown community. Letters and features must be submitted one day later. Bring copy to Room 1B-7 or call 624-8342/3.
Law for the People - activitists meet

by STEVE METALITZ

About two hundred lawyers, law students, and legal workers from throughout the Northeast gathered in Baltimore over Veterans' Day weekend to share their knowledge and political insights during the Northeast Regional Conference of the National Lawyers Guild. Several GULC students and staff were in attendance at the Conference, which explored several aspects of "Law for the People's Movement."

Most of the gathering was dedicated to workshops on a wide range of legal topics, from labor and housing law to criminal procedure, grand juries, and legislative work. The workshops emphasized the practical experiences of Guild members involved in work around these issues. The panelists in the Labor Union workshop, for example, included a staff attorney for the United Electrical Workers, a member of a legal collective doing labor work in the New York-New Jersey region, and a Puerto Rican attorney who discussed the current struggles of unions in America's largest cities.

A separate workshop was devoted to litigation. Most Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which one panelist described as "a limited way to attack discrimination," the two-man-two-attorney strategy of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and two private practitioners from New York and Baltimore—discussed the parameters of discrimination recognized under the act, the remedies available, and the economics of this fast-growing field of practice.

As an even more detailed exposition of aggressive legal strategy was presented in the workshop on Police Abuse. A New Haven attorney has been filing numerous civil suits against the New Haven Police and the New Haven District Court over the past few years. Though favorable settlements are obtained only in a minority of cases, and favorable verdicts even fewer, the barrage of suits over police brutality has existed. Interests in New Haven, and has created a "watchdog presence" which "limits some police excesses." Two Philadelphia legal workers talked about a more wide-ranging assault on police abuses, mounted in conjunction with minority and working-class community groups in the city. The techniques used have included class action litigation (including Rizzo v. Goode, to be argued next week before the Supreme Court), private and personal complaints, exhaustive record keeping and publicity on incidents of police brutality, and the involvement of other public agencies, such as the city Medical Examiner in inquests into the killings of citizens by the police.

A recurring theme throughout many of the workshops was the apparent inadequacy of our current legal mechanisms to deal with repressive police, exploitative companies, and discriminatory employers, and iniquitous grand juries. A University Professor Howard Zinn, in his keynote speech, backed his keynotes with a series of legal limitations, and yet praised the Guild, and other progressive legal organizations for their role in exposing the "twain powers of darkness and force" through which the established American institutions attempt to maintain control of people's movements. Zinn cited mixed reception from his audience, with some listeners criticizing the imprecision of his analysis. Yet the general mood seemed optimistic, and the size and apparent commitment of the participants in the conference suggested that the National Lawyers Guild is alive and well in the Northeast.

by JOCELYN KARP

Monday, November 3
Lecture: "Why Baccaccio?" by Charles Singleton, Johns Hopkins University, emeritus. At the Folger Library 8 p.m.
For more info, call: 546-4800.

Tuesday, November 4
Glims: "A Glimpse of de Kooning" and "Robert Motherwell" at the Hirshhorn. Noon and 7 p.m.

Wednesday, November 5
Free Film Theater. Free Last Boat Home. The fight to save the last river steamboat. Museum of History and Technology. 12:30 p.m.

Thursday, November 6
Part II, five more films, including Life and Death of 9143: A Hollywood Extra

2 p.m. - Paul v. Davis (No. 74-891) Criminal law and procedure involving crime prevention and right of privacy.

Wednesday, November 5
10 a.m. - U.S. v. Mandulino (No. 74-754) Right of "putative defendant" called before grand jury to Mirandize warnings.
11 a.m. - Middendorf v. Henry (No. 74-757) Right of accused in summary court-martial to counsel provided by military service.
1 p.m. - Greer v. Spock (No. 74-848) Authority of commanding officer of military base to prohibit political speeches on base.
2 p.m. - Comm'r of Internal Revenue v. Staple (No. 74-164) Requirement of Commissioner to prove good faith and facts upon which tax assessment is based.
11 a.m. - U.S. v. Tappan (No. 74-753) Jurisdiction of U.S. Court of Claims over suit by federal employees seeking reclassification and back pay.
2 p.m. - Beer v. U.S. (No. 73-1869) New Orleans redistricting plan for city council elections as abridging right to vote on account of race or color.

Monday, November 10

Tuesday, November 11
10 a.m. - Kerr v. USDC for the N. Dist. of Calif. (No. 74-1023) Extension of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(3) qualified privilege of non disclosure to confidential state government documents.
11 a.m. - City of New Orleans v. Nancy Dukes (No. 74-775) Violation of equal protection clause by New Orleans ordinance banning push-cart vendors from Vicus Carre.
1 p.m. - Pa State Board of Pharmacy v. V. Citizen Consumer Council (No. 74-895) State ban on advertising price of prescription drugs as infringements of citizen's right to know.
2 p.m. - Rizzo v. Goode (No. 74-942) Injunctive power of federal district court in redistricting Philadelphia police department to modify procedures.

Wednesday, November 12
10 a.m. - U.S. v. Foster Lumber Co. (No. 74-759) Internal Revenue Code Sec. 1201 loss deduction available for carry-over of net operating loss.
11 a.m. - Hiers v. Anchor Motor Freight, Inc. (No. 74-1025) Employers' claim for wrongful discharge under Sec. 301 of Taft Act.

7 p.m.
6 p.m. - The Midday Muse Concert: The Poten- mac Convent. At the Folger Library, Elizabethan Theatre and Garden. 12:15 p.m. For info, call: 546-2461.
Films: "Batik" and "Creative Hands" At the Renwick Gallery. 11 a.m. noon and 1 p.m.

Sunday, November 9
Lecture: "Paris in Perspective" by Richard H. Randall, Jr., director, the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. At the National Gallery of Art Auditorium, 4 p.m.
Concert: Violin Concerto. At the Phil- lips Collection. 5 p.m. For info call: 387-2151.
Concert: Beverly Sonach, violist; Fritz Jahoda, pianist. National Gallery of Art East Garden Court. 7 p.m.

Friday, November 7
Concert: Julliard String Quartet. At the Library of Congress. 8:30 p.m.
Tickets are required for all concerts at the Library of Congress. They're 25 cents each, limited two to a concert and pickup. No tickets are distributed the Monday before the performance at Campbell Music. 1300 G St., N.W., starrs 8:30 p.m. Get them early. Telephone reservations only may be made after 8:30 a.m. on the Monday preceding the concert. Call 393-4483. For more info on concerts, call 426-5502.

All Smithsonian museums are open 10 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., seven days a week. They're all free. Call 381-6218. Hours and phone numbers for other museums are listed. For more info, call Dial-a-museum: 737-8811.
"Women Look at Women" Photos by and of women from the 1890's to the present. At the Library of Congress. In the Great Corridors, ground floor, main building. Through December 31.
"Art of the Arab World" At the Freer Gallery. Through December.
Philips Collection (Tues-Sat., 10-5, Sun. 7-10), closed Monday, DU-7215) Modern Polish three-dimensional glass, early paintings by Henryk Stazewski, through end of November.
Corcoran Gallery of Art. (Tues-Sun., 11-5, 638-3211. 50 cents with student I.D., $1 for other adults) Jacob Frymer. American limner, through November 16.
Modern Argentinian drawings, through November 9.
Let your computer do the walking through the yellowed pages

Lexis: a revolution in legal research

by DAVID ROCHLIN

Just suppose, for a moment, that you could sit down at a typewriter and, upon request, have displayed before you on an electronic screen any statute or case, state or federal. Better yet, as an added feature, let us say you could submit a word or phrase and quickly get back the list of cases in which it appears. And why not also have a capability to search case material at the counsel or to a judge? Finally, throw in the option of having whatever part of your research you want to have printed at 120 characters per second and immediately available.

Science fiction, right? A law student's pipe dream, right? Not at all. There are, right now, several computer-assisted legal research systems in use, at least one of which is available to anyone who is willing to pay for it.

Computerized legal research really began, in fact, at the Health Law Center of Rockville, Maryland, in 1959. After that, various corporations and universities developed systems for their own use. These systems were quite limited in the capabilities, despite clever acronyms such as STAIRS (IBM's Storage and Information Retrieval System) and DATUM (Documentation Automatique des Textes juridiques de l'Universite de Montreal).

Within seconds, case citations appear, by subject or jurisdiction if desired.

The current state of the art is probably best illustrated by LEKSIS, developed and marketed by Mead Data Central. LEKSIS is a full-text, on-line system, meaning that entire case opinions are available on teleprinters which can be set up wherever there is telephone service. Mead supplies the equipment, training, and data base, which now contains most federal law, plus the most recent law of Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, New York, Ohio, and Texas. Over 100 law and accounting firms have LEKSIS terminals, as do most U.S. government agencies. In all, there are about 200 terminals now on line, with 10,000 trained users. Commenced in 1967, the LEKSIS data files now contain over one billion words, with 1.5 million added every week just to keep it up.

Users save much time, of course, by doing key word searches, such as normally would be done through a digest or treatise. But what is especially helpful, users say, are the capabilities which are not usually available at all. For instance, take the situation in which a colleague tells you, "there's a really important case on point, but all I can remember is that Edward Bennet Williams defended." Normally it would be impossible to find the case. Even with LEKSIS, you would be inundated with cases, unless you could add search parameters, say a year of decision, a specific reporter, or a phrase to look for. But the beauty of the system is that you can use whatever information you do have to limit the search, always maintaining the option to broaden it if you so desire.

Shepherdizing becomes a joy (would you believe, less of a drudgery) with LEKSIS, since, within seconds, the screen will display the list of cases citing the original case, in reverse chronological order. The list may be limited, naturally, by subject or jurisdiction, as you wish. It is then possible, with the touch of a key, to call up any of the listed cases for personal. Key words even appear in special windows for easy recognition.

Training in the mechanical procedures of LEKSIS requires 90 minutes. The video screen fills with characters in seven seconds (faster that it can be read). An average research session takes 20 minutes, of which less than one minute would be actual computer search time. Without LEKSIS, the same research would probably take two or three hours, if it could be done at all.

LEKSIS seems to be a gift from the gods, but there is one little drawback: cost. The smaller commitment schedule promises $1,000 worth of use each month, at an average of $50 per hour for research time plus $195 an hour for actual computer time. The higher use schedule is for at least $2,500 a month at $60 per hour plus the same computer time charge. The initial installation and training fee is $2,500. Obviously, it is the large firms that can afford this investment. But, for them, it is a profitable one.

The time savings are that great.

It must be emphasized that LEKSIS does not replace attorneys, paralegals, law clerks, or even books. The computer and teletype time is far too valuable to spend hours reading at the screen. The display is used, a list of pertinent cases obtained, and then the books are used, but much more efficiently.

One group that was unable to reach an agreement with LEKSIS is to price was the United States Department of Justice. But Justice now has its own system, JURIS, which became operational in July, 1974. The systems are quite similar, but JURIS has the advantage of containing West headnotes in its data base. West was unwilling to let LEKSIS use its headnotes, since they are in direct competition. JURIS, however, is not available outside of the U.S. government.

Lawyers have been exceedingly slow to adopt this new technology.

Susan Bond and Kenneth James, second year GULC students, edit texts for JURIS, to ensure accuracy before the material is received as input. Forrest Rhoads, a first year night student, works full-time on the programming itself. JURIS employs seven attorneys, but all of them were originally in computers, and employment prospects are bleak for lawyers without a solid grounding in computer science.

From the research systems' point of view, there are two major problems, both of which should be surmountable. First, there is the difficulty of getting machine-readable, accurate data from the case reporter. Every time the data is transferred, some mistakes will inevitably be made, necessitating costly editing.

Second, there is the monumental inertia of the legal community. Attorneys have been exceedingly slow to adopt this new technology. Rhoads suggests that this is due to a lack of trust of complex technology, since lawyers have traditionally used books as their exclusive tools. The medical profession, on the other hand, has readily accepted computer-assisted research systems, because medicine is already quite technology-oriented.

However, as the use of LEKSIS, JURIS, and other systems becomes more popular, the price may diminish, and such valuable tools will be available to a wider segment of the legal profession.

Security

(continued from page 1)

non-bolted typewriter in the library was stolen from the locked staff area.

In the first six months, there were 18 reported thefts totaling $1,765. In the latter half of 1974, there were 16 reported thefts totaling $1,525.50. In the first six months of this year there were 19 reported thefts adding up to $1,309. Before last week's thefts from the 1-B office, there had been at least 20 reported thefts since July 1, double the number of reported thefts for the comparable period last year.

Sam Brown, Georgetown's Director of Insurance, said the University's self-insurance program includes a policy of risk control. He said that if a department has to pay most of the cost of what it loses, people in the department will take better care of their equipment.

 Asked about insurance on student articles, Brown said that if the University took charge of a student's final looker over vacation and it disappeared, his office would cover the loss. On other "mysterious disappearances" he said the University would give it "review and consideration to arrive at an equitable decision."

Robinson said the administration is working on a security plan and, "we believe it will be solved shortly."