Clinic report says
Spare Maryland, cut Street Law

Greenhalgh calls report 'premature'

Associate Dean for Clinical Programs William W. Greenhalgh characterized the report of the clinical review committee as a "premature" handling up by a "five-member faculty grand jury with little or no student support."

In a written statement to the Law Weekly Greenhalgh said: "During an 18-month investigation a five-member faculty grand jury with little or no student support has finally handed up a report calling upon the full faculty to reverse several of its recommendations deliberated upon as a result of Academic Standards Committee recommendations as recent as two years ago. The report is not only highly critical of the former Academic Dean as well as the former Clinical Dean, but also the Director of the Pretrial Fellows Program during the period in question. I plead not guilty and will preserve all my defenses for trial, trusting that the full faculty as far-minded juror will keep an open mind until all the evidence is in prior to their rendering yet another verdict."

Greenhalgh, whose resignation from the associate deanship was announced last week, declined any comment beyond the written statement.

Meanwhile, Dean David J. McCarthy, Jr. confirmed in a memo to the faculty this week that Prof. John Kramer will succeed Greenhalgh as clinical dean, effective July 1. McCarthy apologized for the fact that Kramer's appointment has been announced by the Law Weekly before it had been officially announced.

Adjunct Prof. Jason Newman, director of the Teachng Street Law in High Schools Clinic, said he is confident his clinic will continue in substantially the same form despite the committee's recommendation that it be discontinued.

Newman said the report is actually "very favorable" to the clinic in that it concludes that the clinic in (continued on page 8)

LaRaza hits SBA notice

At its last scheduled meeting this year, held last Wednesday, emotions ran high on all sides as the Student Bar Association House of Delegates declined to censure President Julianna Zekan and Deans David Lerner for their roles in the publication of an announcement in the Law Weekly Res Patens column regarding the recent immigration law conference held here.

The announcement was a request for redhacket from students and faculty on the value of the conference. The item said such feedback would "assist the SBA in future funding decisions as to projects of this nature." Lerner drafted the item, and Zekan was one of several SBA officers who saw it before it was published. The censure decisions were made at the request of La Raza, whose members said they were "appalled and angry" at the appearance of the item in the Law Weekly. By taking this unprecedented step, they charged, the SBA was "singing a song" at La Raza and casting aspersions on the value of the immigration law conference. They also said the Res Patens announcement was misleading in that it stated SBA's original allocation of $981 for the conference, but failed to note that final accounting has not been made; the actual cost to SBA will probably be less than $981, they said.

Lerner drafted the announcement and discussed it with Zekan during the week of March 29. She reports that she then questioned the reference to the $981 allocation, but Lerner insisted that leaving it in would generate more response from students. Zekan told him he could run the item if another SBA officer approved.

Lerner turned in the item to the SBA office, where secretary Thaddess Smailan damaged it by adding a sentence at the end by giving the piece the title, "YOUR MONEY? The item was typed up by the Student Activities Office listing Lerner and the SBA as its authors, and was submitted to the Law Weekly in that form.

SBA Vice President David Garza, a La Raza member, saw the item before the Law Weekly got it; he says he understood it would be attributed to David Lerner. However, authors' names are never printed by the Law Weekly in Res Patens items.

When La Raza officer Carlos Recio learned the Res Patens item would be in the paper, his initial reaction was that he was "disappointed, to put it mildly," and ann了一句的 "unique placing of this notice," without consulting La Raza, especially after SBA had already unanimously approved the allocation for the conference, and before the exact expenses had been determined.

Wednesday night's meeting had barely (continued on page 8)

GU finalists picked

In addition to Prof. Thomas Fitzgerald, the 14-year-old president of Fairfield University, named last Friday by the Hoy as one of three finalists for president of Georgetown, the Law Weekly has learned from committee sources that the other two finalists are Fr. Tim Healy, 53, currently chairman of the Philosophy Department at the City University of New York (CUNY) and Fr. Robert Mitchell, 50, presently on sabattical after completing a term as president of the Gonzaga Conference.

The other three candidates from the group of six who are now considered out of the running are Fr. Jim Hennessey, 49, president of the School of Theology at the Loyola University in Chicago; Fr. Joseph Sellinger, the 55-year-old president of Loyola College in Baltimore; and Fr. Thomas Clancy, the Jesuit Provincial for New Orleans.

Committee members refused to comment for the record on any of the names of the candidates and expressed a desire not to publicize their selection process until after the Board of Directors considers the candidates whose names will be submitted this week by the law center. Committee members President John Kramer and former SBA vice president Nannette Warner state that Kramer and Warner are strongly opposed to the candidacy of Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald was formerly the academic vice president of Georgetown. Known as the "silver fox" by friends and foes alike at Georgetown, Fitzgerald's Law Center opposition is attributed to his lack of support for GULC policies and interests while a Georgetown administrator.

(continued on page 8)
La Raza hits SBA item
(continued from page 1)

begun when 2d year delegate Jesse Sligh moved to suspend the agenda and deal with La Raza's complaint. At Sligh's request, executive vice president John Blaske took over the chair because of president Zekan's personal involvement in the affair and vice president David Garza's conflicting interests.

Sligh demanded to know what the author and source to the print the Red Pencils item was. Inez Torres, cochairman of La Raza, presented La Raza's position. La Raza considers the item improper, because it is premature and misleading, according to Torres. It mentions only the 5981 allocation and says nothing about the actual money spent, probably a lower figure.

Lerner defended himself, saying that nothing in the tone of the item implied that the money was ill-spent. SBA always makes its allocations without reference to general guidelines, he said, as a result, he had not been able to go forward with spending guidelines.

SBA has been considering establishing a fund since before Zekan became president this year.

La Raza asked that Lerner be im- peached and Zekan be censured. They did not ask for action against Secretary Thomas Bejar or David Garza. It was decided that impeachment of

Job clinic postponed by JO ANN SCOTT

The planned Employment Dis- crimination Clinic will be delayed at least until next spring in the wake of a funding denial by the Califrit Foundation. Diane Cadrain, director of the clinic, said the delay will give the organization time to work on cases lined up before the clinic starts.

The Employment Discrimination clinic is planned for about 15 students per semester. They will handle cases under Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which covers discrimination in employment due to race, sex, religion or national origin.

The director of the clinic will be Wendy Williams, who will also be a professor here next year.

In addition to publishing articles with Equal Rights Advocates, a public interest law firm working with Stanford students.

The group, which specializes in Title VII questions, has recently received its third $25,000 grant.

The original clinic organizers have turned the job of approaching foundations over to GULC's Development Director Jack Marshall and Edward Martin of main campus's University Relations. Martin is now seeking a funding proposal to the Rockefeller Brothers Foundation. He is also trying to find out exactly why Califrit turned the proposal down.

According to Cadrain, Califrit may have objected to specifics in the proposal, which could be changed. Alternatively, because they have already funded the Juvenile Justice clinic, they may somehow feel that is similar. The clinic hopes to receive funding in time for third year students to be able to include it in their spring registration.

GULC's proposal is for $56,000 for two semesters. Clinics at Georgetown usually start with outside funding. If they are successful the Law Center picks up the funding after the outside grants run out.

Howard University just received an EEOC grant for an equal employment clinic. Columbia's clinic has produced a textbook, Fair Employment Litigation, NYU, Rutgers and Cleveland State also have equal employment clinics.

Cadrain said that equal employment questions are causing much more concern with the continuation of the recession. She said that foundations are not ready to give money for efforts in the field.

Cadrain said, "Ever since we first posed the clinic, people have been saying 'You can't do that.' We won't stop now, having come this far."

La Raza hits SBA item
(continued from page 1)

Lerner would be an idle gesture because he is about to graduate. Since SBA Constitution does not provide for the censure of a member, the House of Dele- gates decided to term the proposed "strong disapproval" of Zekan's and Lerner's actions as "inappropriate.

Lerner faced "strong disapproval" for drafting the original document. The House rejected the proposal by a vote of nine in favor, 19 opposed, and two ab- stentions. Zekan was charged with "fail- ing to prevent" publication of the item. The charge was brought by a vote of 15 in favor, 18 opposed, with seven absten- tions.

At the suggestion of delegate Wendell Rehbin, the House created an ad hoc committee to investigate and establish procedures regarding publication under the SBA name. The statement of the authorization of Lerner, Zekan, Bejar to print the Red Pen- cils item in question as an SBA docu- ment had been discussed but not resolved at the meeting. It was not clear whether the vote on the motion to censure Zekan reflected the House's belief that she had acted within her authority or that the document was not censurable.

SBA created an ad hoc committee to draft an apology to La Raza and the stu- dent body. That apology appears on page seven of this issue.

Ravitz offers realism rhetoric in Feldman lecture by STEPHEN KLUTZMAN

"There's an inverse relationship between the level of intimidation that exists in a court and the level of justice. I've tried to reverse it but it's not easy."

The speaker was Detroit Judge Justin C. Feldman, who spoke both rationally and rhetorically Friday night to a near-capacity audience in Halls 6 and 7.

Self-described "radical" and "people's lawyer," the 35-year-old Ravitz was elected to his present position in 1972 to a 10-year term on the Detroit Recorder's (Criminal) Court.

After this election, the New York Times labeled Ravitz the "first known political radical to sit on an American criminal court bench."

The paper described the efforts of the 1968 Michigan law graduate to change the intimidating and incomprehensible atmosphere that prevails in many American courtrooms. It reported how Ravitz explained the rights and duties of parties in simple, deliberate, comprehensible English rather than "legalese fancy talk," dispensed with courtroom rituals, and had the people in his "people's court" stand only when truly necessary, not the judge.

The Times also quoted Ravitz's more conventional colleagues who either praised him for his legal knowledge, patience, and evenhandedness or claimed he was biased toward defendants.

On Friday, Ravitz described himself as a "serious, socialistic intellectual" who believes "the courts should provide a forum for the peaceful resolution of disputes" but who also believes that "the law is designed to tolerate and perpetuate class and race divisions and imperialistic wars."

Working "within the system," Ravitz has tried "to keep the oppressed system involved" and to make the courtroom less intimidating and more responsive to the average citizen. Nevertheless, he said he "doesn't think there's a great deal one can do in the legal system to promote change."

So, Ravitz told his mostly young, inter- racially mixed audience, it was still important to develop a political analysis to turn the power of the system down. He coined the phrase "you can't fight City Hall," he replied, urging his listeners to keep fighting to "change the system."

Judge Ravitz's talk was the first to be presented by the Michael Feldman Juve- nile Marian Lecture Series. Feldman, a 25- year-old, third-year GULC day student, died last April in a household accident.

In addition to the lecture series, Mike Feldman's family and friends have established an advocacy award to be given to the most promising advocate in the Criminal Justice Clinic.

Feldman was regarded Friday night as a "young, progressive person on the side of people." Judge Ravitz seemed to fit that description himself in both his personal appearance and political rhetoric. Dressed in a blue floral print "Western" shirt, blue cord slacks with a wide brown belt, and wearing white love beads and tinted glasses, the ex-mourned Ravitz resembled more a hip law clerk than one of nation's busiest criminal court bench.

Nor was Ravitz's sixthies "right on" rhetoric what one hears from the typical "bunch warmer." Speaking in a low-keyed, folksy style reminiscent of comic Dan Greengold, Ravitz began by seizing the judicial mystique of black-robed judges sitting on high benches surrounded by clerks, bailiffs, and state and national flags. Noting the "courtroom-like atmos- phere" of Halls 6-7, Ravitz claimed his layout, like that of many courts, was "in- timidating by design."

To dispel the mystique in his own courtroom, Ravitz neither wore a robe or displayed an American flag. Then the Michigan Supreme Court passed a law which came known as the "Ravitz rule," re- quiring every judge in the state to wear a robe and "comprehensibly display" the flag. Ravitz said he now wears "a rusty torn robe" and someday "may wear a red robe."

(Ravitz gained national attention in December 1972 when his opponents tried to impeach him for failing to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance at his swearing in ceremony, a failure "based on the re- newed and intensified bombing of Indo- china and the stark absence of liberty and justice for all."

The rhetorical Ravitz was eloquent about the sexism, racism, and poverty en- demic to the "criminal injustice system - America's only working railroad."

At one point, Ravitz quoted Anatole France who said that "the law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor from sleeping under bridges, begging for money or stealing bread."

For his part, Ravitz said he has never im- prisoned anyone who "shoplifts or steals for survival," although he has often had to find police guilty of the "crime of poverty."

Ravitz also spoke rhetorically on the need for a new Bill of Rights guaranteeing absolute rights to food, housing and employment; said he was not opposed to capital punishment for people like Nixon who were "dangerous, unable to be re- habilitated and control the forces of power;" and described Jimmy Carter as "an agribusinessman and a conservative" whose "hands are as dirty as his teeth."

When he got to the part of his lecture on his own actions as a judge, Ravitz became more inclusive and less rhetorical. He told about a "corporate crime" case, The State of Michigan v. Arthur De Clerk and Wrigley's Febrezen- ker, Inc. The defendants were charged with misrepresenting the weight of 33 of 40 packaged meats tested by a state meat inspector. This was a violation of a little known weights and measures act.

Ravitz refused to accept a "no contest" plea in return for the dismissal of charges against the meat clerk. This had been the standard operating procedure between the prosecution and corpora- tions in such cases.

Instead, Ravitz fined Wrigley's the maximum amount and in a separate hearing trial for sentence he sentenced him to one day in the Detroit House of Corrections. "Until the Michi- gan Court of Appeals reverses it, the only reason the defendant is in one of the more unique decisions," Ravitz noted.

Ravitz was also reversed in a case in- volving police brutality and Ireland's "lessness." A police officer fraudulently pro- cessed an arrest warrant against a man charged with assaulting the officer. When the alleged assaulter was brought in to be arraigned, Ravitz saw he had been beaten far worse than the policeman. In a subsequent hearing, Ravitz dismissed the charges against the defendant. Abstained a protest recom- mendation on a counter-charge brought by a court-appointed attorney against the officer. Ravitz ruled that the officer's statute that allowed a judge to issue a warrant without the recommendation of the prosecutor or the complaint complainant.

Abstained from the former defendant, now complainant, "I know you're indigent but man, do you get a dollar?" The court-ap- pointed attorney had originally claimed the complaint was reversed.

In all, he said he has been reversed for every one has been a political case," he noted.

(continued on page 3)
GULC while serving as Counsel to the Federal Elections Commission, will speak as an alumni/an reunion set for Saturday, May 1 at the Law Center. The faculty will hold a morning seminar on the Supreme Court 1975-6 term; the moderator will be Prof. Sherman Gluck, an afternoon session on the Karen Quinan case may be held. Prof. Wikrowich and King and Fr. Malloy will participate. All students are invited to attend.

Investment panel

Should the U.S. government insure private American investment in developing countries against the risks of expropriation, war, or the inability to transform profits into convertible currencies for repatriation? Should this function be provided by private insurance companies instead? The Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the U.S. agency providing such insurance, was ordered by legislation passed in 1974 to transfer its function to the private insurance industry, OPIC's ability to do so, and the wisdom of such a policy, will be the subject of a panel discussion held in the Moot Courtroom on Wednesday, April 21st, from 2:00 to 4:30 p.m.

The panel discussion is sponsored by the James Brown Scott Society of International Law, Law and Policy in International Business, and the Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law. Prominent speakers from Congress, the Commerce Department, OPIC, the insurance industry, Multinational Enterprises, and Academia will be featured. All interested students are encouraged to attend. For further information contact Ron Severd at 624-8330 or John Banner at 624-8274.

Tenure decisions

Law Center Dean David J. McCarthy announced the results of the University-wide Tenure and Tenure Committee deliberations approved by University President Hanse, that Associate Professors Judith Areen, Charles Gustafson, and Heinchothe "Pete" Wales and Professor Victor Karner were all granted tenure, effective July 1, 1976.

In addition, Professor Areen was promoted to the rank of Professor, making her the second woman on the current Law Center faculty to hold that position. Under new Rank and Tenure Committee guidelines, an associate professor can be granted tenure on the basis of his academic promise, but he must be promoted to the rank of full professor because of insufficient publications or other reasons. Gustafson and Wales will go through the normal promotion processes at a later date.

BALSAC convention

Over 700 black attorneys, law students, and local and national dignitaries will meet to discuss legal strategies to affect change in unemployment, health care delivery, and education at the Black American Law Students Association’s (BALSAC) national convention, April 13-18 at Howard University’s Darlington campus.

BALSAC will sponsor a number of topics including her husband’s years in exile, current legal developments, and future plans. Her appearance is sponsored by BALSAC and will be today in Room 1B-32 at 1 p.m.

Cleaver will speak

Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black activist Eldridge Cleaver, will speak at GULC today. The appearance was previously planned and cancelled due to problems in Cleaver’s schedule, is definite according to Grace Lockett-Romero.

Cleaver’s speech will discuss a number of topics including her husband’s years in exile, current legal developments, and future plans. Her appearance is sponsored by BALSAC and will be today in Room 1B-32 at 1 p.m.

GULC to get signs

After almost five years without any decorative signs, GULC will be bounded by two new signs: a 16-foot-tall, painted white letters bearing “Georgetown University Law Center,” and two-inch square signs, non-electric and made of fabricated aluminum, will be set in concrete at the corner of 2nd and F streets and on First Street near the front entrance stairs.

Four-inch square signs of white lettering in black letters2 bearing “Georgetown University Law Center,” are set in concrete at the corner of 2nd and F streets and on First Street near the front entrance stairs.

GRADUATES

Do you know what it would cost to keep in touch with GULC by phone? New York $1.08 Denver $1.24
Boston $1.14 San Francisco $1.30
for three minutes

A Law Weekly Subscription with 25 issues for $5 tells you a lot more for a lot less.

Stop by room 1B-7 and subscribe now.
Dean's 1st year & GULC's problems

A year ago this month, the Board of Directors announced the appointment of the new dean of the Law Center, climaxing a long, disordered, and often acrimonious Dean Search process. In a manner that would have been better orchestrated by Agatha Christie, (as in her novel And Then There Were None) where twelve people are invited to an island and all are methodically and mysteriously killed off, a promising field of candidates was quickly reduced to two by personal withdrawals and faculty blackballs. Faced with a choice of two men, neither with national or scholarly reputations, both products of the Law Center themselves, the Board of Directors opted for the safer, less controversial, insider candidate, David J. McCarthy, Jr.

Now, after a year of the McCarthy regime, we think it wise to look back and reflect on the nature of his tenure as Dean, and some of the problems he faces.

There can be no denying that the new Deans, McCarthy and his chosen assistant, Flegel, have increased the efficient operation of certain administrative functions -- earlier registration forms, increased pressure on professors to get their grades in on time, etc. Certainly in any institution the size of the Law Center the smooth operation of these administrative matters is essential to the effective running of the school.

An academic environment, however, ought to be more than just an efficiently run beehive, turning out standardized, perfectly adequate, but unimaginative attorneys. Granted that students and professors at GULC must work under more difficult odds than their counterparts at other schools, chief among them the lack of communication with other institutions of learning, the tremendous size of the classes, the lack of any integration into a greater community or local neighborhood, there is still more that can be done to make this institution more of an intellectual, stimulating atmosphere.

There is a malaise affecting the school which even the most efficiently-run administration cannot overcome. The malaise extends more deeply than annual anxiety over exams. It is in part a reflection of the depressed job market, and perhaps, the lack of national purpose which serves to inject meaning into the lives of citizens. Or it may be simply a reflection of the boredom of the law school curriculum, a boredom which affects both students and professors alike.

While nothing can be done to put the Law Center physically in a definite neighborhood, or even in a more college-like university environment, both of which would alleviate the sense of alienation here, certain concrete steps can and should be taken to make the school more human, and, in turn, more interesting and challenging.

The first of these is to cut down the size of the student body. Instead of pursuing an aggressive transfer campaign to get the full compliment of students here for every year, the school ought to cut back on enrollments to the size predicted for the school originally, perhaps some five hundred students less than it is today. A concession to this is the implementation of the small-enrollment first-year section killed by the general faculty last year. This proposal, which could have worked without any additional funds, would have guaranteed each first year student one class of forty or so students.

On the educational level, professors should be rewarded, either by pay increases, or other benefits, for their scholarly activities, and for their effectiveness in teaching up-to-date theories of law in an interesting and stimulating manner. There are too many professors, otherwise perfectly lovable, at this school, who are teaching their courses today as they taught them twenty years ago, and as they were taught in turn when they were Georgetown students.

Another method of increasing the educational value of the school would be to increase the financial aid endowment so that students would not be forced to work to support themselves and pay their tuition. While some work can be a valuable learning experience in and of itself, the general effect of having large numbers of students working is to have fewer students prepared in class, and a more fragmented, less focused student body, who see the Law Center as a way station between office hours and study.

On a more gut level, the Dean and his Associate should turn their attention to the more efficient provision of student services. They should negotiate with the Main Campus to have offshoots of their services here at the Law Center. Chief among these are career services. Since most students live nearer to the Law Center than to the Hilltop, there should be a doctor's office hours here on a regular basis. As was apparent during last winter's flu season, many students were too sick to go on the long and erratically scheduled GUTS bus to the Main Campus health services.

Part of attending a University is the opportunity to discuss one's subject of study with those in other fields. Law Center students and faculty are denied this valuable inter- change because of our isolation from the Main Campus. Another way of integrating law students into the greater University would be to sponsor interdisciplinary seminars and lectures, to be held on both campuses with frequent GUTS service between them on the night of the affair, with other graduate and professional departments.

Yet all of these changes which we propose can be accomplished easily, or cheaply. They are, at best, minimum recommendations which we believe the Dean ought to take seriously into account. It is not enough to make Georgetown more pleasant from the point of view of the University Computer services who no longer have late grades and registration forms to contend with. The students, their educational and psychological needs must come first if Georgetown is to produce interesting, stimulating, and happy attorneys instead of mere legal technicians.

The Ruff Report

One of the better programs the Law Center has to offer, and one which makes up, in many student minds, for the years spent in large lectures, is the clinical program. The long-overdue Ruff report strikes at the heart of the clinical program, and essentially necessitates the litigating clinics. For a student to receive only three credits for clinical work during the second semester of a litigating clinic, the time when most cases come to fruition, is to foreclose all but the summer school enthusiasts who have built up a credit reserve from participating. While it is perhaps not fair to grant academic credit for travel and waiting time which take up a good deal of a clinical student's time, it is unrealistic to expect him to give both to his client and adequate attention to courses if they are forced to carry a heavy academic load to make up for lost credit hours.

We regret the late timing of the report and hope that it was not so released in order to avoid student discussion. Prof. Ruff has indicated that his committee welcomes student comments, written or oral. If his committee really wanted student input, they would have released the report at an earlier time, not when classes are about to end and exams loom near.

Nonetheless, we urge all students interested in clinical education to protest the reduction of clinical hours for the litigating clinics. To close more students out of these programs would be to stop one of the best and most stimulating forms of legal education GULC has to offer. We call on the faculty, which has the ultimate decision-making power, to reject these findings of the report, and maintain the clinics at their current credit hours.
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Spiegel's Farewell: Student Journalism

by SCOTT SPIEGEL

Dan Morrissey, GULC '74, and former editor-in-chief of the Law Weekly, wrote a farewell column in the last issue of the paper before his graduation. He quoted the phrase "GULC Gestalt" to describe the unity he put forth in the Law Center. At the time, the Law Center community was unified in its battles with the Hilltop administration. Dan's farewell appropriately rallied to that theme.

I think it is appropriate that I address an issue which is timely today and one that often confuses various members of the Law Center community. The journal's instinct is a misunderstood quality in our society. The clash between the press and the legal profession, which positions the first amendment against the sixth amendment, has often undermined the ephemeral alliances which are sometime built between lawyers and reporters.

Within the Law Center community itself, the Law Weekly, in its devotion to aggressive news reporting in an academic community, is committed to journalistic functions which should light on the community itself. In the past three years, several stories have exposed certain truths and changed others. The standards to which the legal community must adhere in the practice of law are carefully constructed to determine guilt or innocence, responsibility, and a right of access. These standards do not govern reporters but rather on publication and libel laws and the same facts.

Several major news stories which I have written, helped to develop, or coordinate during the past three years have been marked by controversy and criticism. The test of a good newspaper is its ability to withstand the pressures and accept the criticism without caving into pressure. The Law Weekly has developed the necessary distance to insure that pressures do not force the paper to give in to unconscionable demands. During the emotional period of the Dean's Search when the list of final candidates was narrowed to three, tempers flared at the continual revelations in the Law Weekly. The faculty believed that the information was in secret to whitis its own list to three. Suggestions that each faculty member take an oath not to leak were gaining support. One member of the faculty with whom I spoke during this period said in frustration that "the Law Weekly is not the New York Times and the Dean's Search story is not the Pentagon Papers." He added that GULC's budgetary control over the Law Weekly's finances should be used as leverage to control the paper's contents.

The statement reveals the malignant anxiety of many people about the aggressiveness of a student newspaper. The Law Weekly has not only felt the need not to destroy the institution it serves but it also created. The paper has refrained from publishing certain stories recognizing that the public and some on campus may be benefitted. The decision not to print these stories has come from the standards of any reporter properly and professionally.

F. Hents, the outgoing Dean of Georgetown University, complained to me last spring that he had not been for the Law Weekly's relentless coverage of the Dean's Search story, Yale professor John Simon believed that the Law Center's dean, Simon ultimately found the public helpful because it only confirmed the things he had already suspected which friends relayed to him.

To confide the staff's obligations and distinguishing their role as students from the role as reporters does nothing but make the paper's role all the more unique. The truth about what transpires in open papers is law schools. The tradition will be preserved when the closing bell rings.

Why a student should turn down a job

This article is not intended to be a criticism of any law journal or of any person who chooses to serve on the staff of one. Neither is it a plea to those who receive journal invitations to refuse them. Instead, it is intended to suggest that refusing a journal invitation is a viable alternative to accepting one and explain what one refuses may expect and of the decision is made.

My first suggestion is to come to a well-thought-out rationale for deciding not to accept a journal invitation. You may feel that your decision is a personal one, that you need not justify it to anyone. You are wrong. You must justify it to family, friends, employers, and anyone who happens to hear of the decision you have made.

Although a strong desire to spend the last two weeks of August on vacation rather than in the journal office is a strong dislike for blabbering and typing is legitimate reasons for refusing a journal invitation, they will not be met with the approval of many. (It is not mean to imply that journal work is all typing and blabbering; it is much more. I do feel, however, that it would be better for both student and journal only those truly interested in journal work would accept the invitations.)

A much stronger reason is the desire to work. Of course, most law students need some means of financial support while working, which is a highly valuable experience as well. I do not doubt that golf work is an excellent means of earning money, but working enables you to develop certain skills that you probably will not gain through the journal. If you work for a law firm, you will learn the difference between a complaint and an answer, how to write some as well as interogatories, motions, and briefs, all of the everyday things a law practice is made of. Employment and volunteer positions also exist for those interested in legislative, administrative, and public interest work.

But theft you may have heard that you won't find a job without a journal behind you. That is simply not true. Many journal staff members have no time to work in addition to their class and journal work. Those who are issued journal invitations may refuse them because very attractive job candidates. You will have no trouble securing any number of interviews. Just the fact that you have "law journal - invitation declined" on your resume makes employers curious to have to interview you if for no reason other than to ask "What did you turn down law journal?" (This invariably will be the first question any employer will ask.)

You can consider both alternatives carefully before making your final decision; how do you want to spend your time? What kind of experience do you want? What are your other commitments? Whatever you do, never consider the prestige of journal aside, will be as much value to you as in terms of your own personal goals and plans. Perhaps most importantly, in which situation will you be comfortable and satisfied?
Letters to the editor

To the editor:

I would like this opportunity to clarify the large surrounding industry resignation as Assistant Director of Placement. It is ironic that Mrs. Tucci was unable to see the problems of the office, and thus, I felt that much-needed changes in the office would be impossible. This attitude of student disinterest and comprehension of the Placement Office is reflected and illustrated by the remark of Mrs. Sullivan in her statement to the Law Weekly on April 5, 1976. She stated, "This is the best environment I've ever worked in." This statement makes little sense in light of the facts, considering three reservations in the last month and the possibility of more to follow. Moreover, this situation was not one that materialized over night, the mood in the Placement Office was far from being cordial for many weeks before.

Furthermore, Sullivan's statement that the Law Weekly "relied on the word of a disgruntled employee," is simply incorrect. It is my understanding that at least two sources were needed before any fact would be printed. Mr. Steets, letter clearly indicates that other people are upset by the situation in the Placement Office as well. More importantly, the fact that Mrs. Sullivan made this remark after the publication of an editorial expressing student disinterest with the Placement Office highlights her lack of understanding of the problems of the Office.

The final irony is that it was reported in the Law Weekly that I was "choked for making Inquorating remarks about Georgetown." This is simply not the case. On this I stand on my excellent record and the fact that even after my resignation I worked many long hours on the GULC production of "Patience." Certainly a disgruntled employee would not have continued to put forth this extracurricular effort.

It is my sincerest hope that the problems in the Placement Office will be resolved as soon as possible so that the students can have full benefit of a very important service.

Margot Buchholz, Former Asst. Director

To the editor:

"Neophyte" defends office

"Neophyte" defends office..." liability and leadership, I was informed that these were not my concern. Mrs. Tucci was unable to see the problems of the office, and thus, I felt that much-needed changes in the office would be impossible. This attitude of student disinterest and comprehension of the Placement Office is reflected and illustrated by the remark of Mrs. Sullivan in her statement to the Law Weekly on April 5, 1976. She stated, "This is the best environment I've ever worked in." This statement makes little sense in light of the facts, considering three reservations in the last month and the possibility of more to follow. Moreover, this situation was not one that materialized over time, the mood in the Placement Office was far from being cordial for many weeks before.

Furthermore, Sullivan's statement that the Law Weekly "relied on the word of a disgruntled employee," is simply incorrect. It is my understanding that at least two sources were needed before any fact would be printed. Mr. Steets, letter clearly indicates that other people are upset by the situation in the Placement Office as well. More importantly, the fact that Mrs. Sullivan made this remark after the publication of an editorial expressing student disinterest with the Placement Office highlights her lack of understanding of the problems of the Office.

The final irony is that it was reported in the Law Weekly that I was "choked for making Inquorating remarks about Georgetown." This is simply not the case. On this I stand on my excellent record and the fact that even after my resignation I worked many long hours on the GULC production of "Patience." Certainly a disgruntled employee would not have continued to put forth this extracurricular effort.

It is my sincerest hope that the problems in the Placement Office will be resolved as soon as possible so that the students can have full benefit of a very important service.

Margot Buchholz, Former Asst. Director

To the editor:

I noticed with interest an invitation, ostensibly from the SBA, for comment from those attending a conference on immigration law recently put on at the Law Center by La Raza. In replying, I do not raise more questions than I answer.

The conference itself was a demonstrable success, its greatest achievement being the depth in which it covered several significant developments in immigration law were treated. The value of the conference can be seen in the fact that participants included not only concerned members of the religious, and Latino groups, but also ranking Immigration and Naturalization Service officials, noted academicians, and prominent practitioners of this important and too long ignored area of the law. La Raza is to be commended for its initiative and skill in presenting the conference, particularly in a year during which the SBA, by contrast, has provided remarkably little in the way of speakers, symposia, or entertainment. One can only applaud the efforts of the SBA in its funding are appropriately. We are all too aware of past abuses of SBA revenues, which, after all, derive from tuition. Yet the methods and implications of the SBA's published inquiries into past abuses are at least unsettling. If the SBA sincerely desire to judge the success of the conference: a) where the conference might be held in the future, and b) why the prominent display of a perhaps misleading figure on the conference's ceiling? The SBA this year has been presented with a situation it has not hitherto had a proposal to set guidelines for its handling of financial requests from student organizations. Surely such a broader-based approach would be more useful than after-the-fact analysis when the event has already been held and the funds expended. All the more so in this case, where the SBA as a body is overwhevely approved funding less than a month ago. The figure authorized then, and so prominently displayed in the SBA request, was $591. However, since the final accounting has not been completed, and since some expenses may be offset by contributions from organizations such as the ABA Law Student Division, total expenses may be well below the $91 figure. The SBA wording ignores this likelihood and might be viewed as an attempt to "load" the responses which it seeks.

If the SBA is planning to adopt a system of post-event analysis, it would seem better advised to involve the entire SBA in establishing criteria and procedures, rather than rely on the perceptions of individual members, neither an SBA officer nor a member of a relevant SBA committee.

I have been given to understand that Mr. David Lerner acted on his own initiative in drafting a memo, rather than if not hystetically, captioned "YOUR MONEY" for submission to the Law Weekly, Mr. Lerner's zeal in combatting what he has termed an apparent abuse, is the Law Center's H.R. Gross (a former Assistant Commissioner of legendary parsimony, for those whose trivial store does not run to Midwestern Republicans); such zeal does not always ensure the most balanced or objective view, however. Without debating the merits of solving such weighty questions of high policy as this one apparently is, at least to Mr. Lerner, through a Rex Penges item, would it not be wiser to regularize the process and involve the entire SBA more directly?

One final point: this unprecedented request for student comment may convey an unfortunate impression. La Raza members may feel, mistakenly, I hope, that their successful event has been singled out for post-mortem critique on unspecified standards as a matter of deliberate choice, rather than through mere administrative maladroitness. Establishing standards and regular policies, with the involvement of the entire SBA, would help dispel that unfortunate impression.

Morrison CAIN '76

The judge in protest.

To the editor:

As a Georgetown Alumnus of the College and the Law Center and as a member of the bench, it was with feelings of shock, disgust and apprehension that I learned of the firing of Associate Dean William Greenhalgh. History truth does repay itself and we once again witness the swift removal of a voice of dissent.

Upon later reflection, the words of the immortal Bard spring to mind: "How much sharper than a serpent's tooth is a thankless child." Greenhalgh has behaved with love and dedication for the benefit of the students and the improvement of the Law Center, and for many successes resulting in considerable advantage to the local community, the legal profession, and to the Law Center.

As chairman of the Board of Judges Committee on Third Year Law Student Practice, I and the members of the Committee have been advised and consulted with Dean Greenhalgh on many occasions. Were it not for his reasoned, deliberate, logical preparatory of programs which expanded the concept of clinical practice into virtual practice, I feel certain that such practice would still be limited to a relatively few students practicing in Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant courts.

In addition to his expertise and the reliance on his advice by CLEPR, the Ford Foundation, immortalizable court, was for which Greenhalgh was obtained for successful clinical programs. Otherwise would never have come to fruition.

I infer Dean Greenhalgh's removal from office can only lead to a diminution of funding which is so urgently needed by the Law Center, and considering also the "Ruff Report," a reduction in clinical education at Georgetown. If the recommendations of the "Ruff Report" are adopted by September of this year, Georgetown students would be unable to gain clinical experience except in the simulated atmosphere of the Ruff program and the most recent rules of this court for clinical practice requiring approval for a clinical program of five credits per semester effective September, 1977. It is absurd to think that the most respected and prestigious aspect of the Law Center's Clinical program, admired and emulated across the nation, will join the Law Center library and the student-faculty ratio in providing amusement at law school meetings across the nation.

In view of the Law Center's recent loss of an expected grant from the Fritz Foundation to fund a clinical program concerned with job discrimination and women, the trend may already have started.

I have great respect for Professor Kramer, Dean Greenhalgh's purported successor, whose ability and achievements are unmeasured by the standard of leadership. My sympathy is extended to the students and to those presently on this most distressing Blitzkrieg firing of Dean Greenhalgh.

Alfred Burke, Judge

La Raza conference

"Neophyte" defends office..."
TURKEY!

That's what you are if you expect to graduate and you haven't submitted a request for a diploma to the Registrar's Office.

The deadline is fast approaching.
Contact Mrs. Sholesky, extension 300 immediately if you want to avoid the ax.

LIBRARY NOTES

Library hours, April 22 through May 15: 6 a.m. - 2 a.m. (subject to change). Open on holidays and weekends.

GOOD LUCK ON EXAMS!

Experience the Ultimate Hair

CAPITOL HILL 325 SEVENTH STREET SE
546-5110

Women's Rights meeting

All students interested in the present and future activities of the Women's Rights Collective are invited to share wine and cheese and talk about the past on Wednesday, April 14, at 5:30 p.m. in Room 1-B-11. We'll discuss the employment discrimination in clinic, and you'll talk about your responses to the conference on women and the law, which several of us attended. We'll pick our officers for next year, Friday students especially encouraged to attend.

Balsa banquet

The National Black American Law Students Association will hold its annual Balsa Awards Banquet at 7:30 p.m. on April 14 at the Metropolitan Park Hotel with a reception at 6:30 p.m. Donation is $35.00. For further information contact Edna Wells, 5151 F St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Capitol Hill parking limits

Interested parties may present their views concerning the establishment of a "residential parking area in the Capitol Hill area at a Public Forum to be held at 7 p.m., April 29, at 900 Junior High School, 7th and C Streets, S.E.

In areas that are approved, parking will be limited to a consecutive two-hour period between the hours of 7 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. on weekdays (except holidays).

Violations will result in a $50 parking citation being issued to the owner of the vehicle at the discretion of the police. Those wishing to be heard at the meetings are requested to furnish their names, addresses and the time the parking citations were issued.

Library hours

Library hours, April 22 through

All GUTS suspension

All G.U.T.S. regular route service will be suspended from April 16th (Good Friday) through April 18th, 1976 during the three days Easter Holiday.

Regular route service will resume on Monday April 19, 1976.
Ruff report: more work for same credits

(continued from page 1)

praised. "It became clear during our evaluations of the individual clinics that important substantive changes were being made in the content of the clinic without the faculty's having had an opportunity to review them," the report states. Nonetheless, the committee approved the use of outside supervisors in the Legislative Action, Lawyering in the Public Interest and Securities and Exchange Commission clinics.

The committee said that while it is "generally skeptical of farm-out arrangements," there are two situations in which they should be approved; areas such as legislation where direct faculty supervision of student work is not possible, and areas where clinics do not exist and faculty members do not possess the necessary expertise. The committee said Prof. Joseph Page's Lawyering in the Public Interest Clinic actually functions as a clinical independent studies program in which field work replaces the traditional paper--a concept the committee endorsed and feels should be expanded.

That clinic will not be offered next year while Prof. Page is onabbatical. The report includes the following recommendations:

- No student should be allowed to take more than 14 clinical credits, as compared to the present maximum of 18 credits. With graduation, reduction of credits for most clinics this would allow a student to take both a second- and third-year clinic.
- A core of senior clinical instructors with tenure (graduates) fellows would continue to be used as supervisors under the general direction of senior instructors and with a lighter teaching load at present.

Clinics need not be forced into the traditional semester framework. Clinics could be run on a year-round basis to spread out fixed expenses such as rent. Students in year-long clinics might take all of their clinical classroom work and the bulk of their credits in the first semester, with continuing responsibility for cases, but no clinical classes and fewer credits in the second.

Second-year students should be permitted to participate in existing clinics where they can do the work, but no new slots or programs should be created to accommodate them.

Clinical seminars such as Prof. Paul Conway's Family Law seminar, which use a "limited field component as an adjunct to the classroom discussion," should be encouraged. The committee noted that amendments to the D.C. Superior Court Rules requiring a minimum of five credits per semester for all litigating clinics by September 1997 will "drastically limit our ability to experiment with new clinical forms," and recommends that "efforts be made to discuss this one-case-assignment unintended result with Judges Burka, Green et al., to convince them to provide some means for authorizing the creation of more limited clinical offerings."

Maryland Criminal Justice

The final report on the Maryland Clinic indicates most of the committee's criticisms should be developed. Prettyman

Greenhalgh: 'wait for all evidence'

(continued from page 1)

enthusiastically supported by students and faculty. Newman said he disagrees with the committee's low estimate of the clinic's academic value.

Newman said clinical programs have been questioned in the past and "the law always gets the scrutiny because it's, the most unique." Hammond School is considering starting a Street Law program for academic credit based on the Georgetown model. An associate dean will be visiting this week to observe the program. Newman has been asked to explain the program.

"The wave of the future is what we're doing," Newman said.

Edward O'Brien, deputy director of the Street Law Clinic includes most of the committee's criticisms should have given greater weight to the student's evaluations of the academic value of the clinic. He said questionnaires returned by 18 students in the clinic showed one rated it as the best academic experience he had at GULC; 11 rated it as "one of the best," and it rated it as better that average. He said the students unanimously agreed it was worth six credits and 96 percent said it was worth eight or more.

Students in the Street Law: High

With this issue, the Law Weekly stops publication for the year.

Good luck on exams, and have a good vacation.