Healy denies Ritchie tenure

By Robert Schwansburg
University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., has determined to deny tenure to Law Center Prof. Larry Ritchie because of "insufficient evidence of scholarship." Father Healy's decision disregards the recommendations of the GULC student tenure committee, GULC Faculty Tenure Committee, GULC tenured faculty, and University Rank and Tenure Committee that Ritchie be granted tenure.

Law Center Dean David J. McCarthy Jr. informed Ritchie on June 9 of Father Healy's decision. Ritchie, who was on the fourth floor at the time, met with the Law Center to express his bitterness at the decision. Father Healy has yet to formally notify Ritchie of the decision; but it is known that a letter advising Ritchie of the denial is awaiting Father Healy's signature.

The Law Weekly has learned that McCarthy twice requested Ritchie to withdraw his application for tenure, but Ritchie refused. Instead, Ritchie wrote a letter to Father Healy asking him to reconsider his decision. Healy has not formally notified Ritchie of the decision, but it is known that a letter advising Ritchie of the denial is awaiting Father Healy's signature.

Father Healy refused to answer any questions by the Law Weekly including those regarding the basis for his decision. Ritchie will seek redress by law. Ritchie submitted his article, "Composition Which continued on page 7."

President demands scholarship worthy of "premier" law school

University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., yesterday told the Law Center's tenured faculty his two critical reasons for not granting scholarship in deciding tenure questions. Healy said that the scholarly material submitted must: (1) materialistically forward the law school, and (2) must pass muster at a "premier" law school, according to sources present at the meeting. Both criteria must be met before tenure will be given.

Father Healy told the twenty-four tenured law faculty that after reading the record submitted to him regarding tenure for Law Center Professor Larry Ritchie and the evaluations of Ritchie's work, he has not reached a decision.

Father Healy did not secure into account Ritchie's brief in United States v. Hale before deciding to deny Ritchie tenure, the source said.

By "premier" law schools Father Healy meant Harvard or its equivalent, sources said. Father Healy's standard was, "would this person get tenure at Harvard on the basis of this article?", according to sources.

Many law professors took exception with this attitude. "This is Harvardization on the cheap," one professor present at the meeting told the Law Weekly. "The way they get good articles at Harvard is by giving their professors research assistants, time off, and light teaching loads to get their writing done. But, this takes money. We do it on the cheap; we just don't do it the same way.

Sources also indicated that the law faculty was concerned about the weight Father Healy placed on the continued on page 8.

GU panel recommends tenure for Prof. Shuman

By Dave McCall
University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., has asked the University Rank and Tenure Committee (URT) to reconsider its recommendation that Father Healy grant tenure to Law Center Professor Jerome Shuman. The committee, which has twice recommended tenure for Shuman, will have to re-examine the case before making a final decision.

Again in time for him to make a final decision by July 1, Shuman's tenure candidacy has been in process since last October. At that time, the student tenure committee recommended by a six-to-three vote that Shuman be granted tenure. The five-member Faculty Affairs Committee, however, recommended that Shuman not get tenure. The full tenured law center faculty voted in December not to recommend Shuman for tenure.

Shuman has taken the unprecedented step of carrying his own tenure candidacy to the next-highest decision-making body, the URTC. According to Prof. Donald Schwartz, chairman of the law center's Faculty Affairs Committee, only one other tenure candidate has been voted down by the tenured faculty in ten years. That was Julian Kosow, who resigned from the faculty in 1975 after the tenured faculty voted against him.

The names of the other tenure candidates approved by the tenured law center faculty are automatically forwarded to the URTC for consideration. The URTC's recommendations go directly to Father Healy for his final decision.

Law Center Prof. Adrian S. Fisher was the Law Center's representative to the URTC this year. According to a source who was present, Fisher urged the members of the committee to vote in favor of giving Shuman tenure. The five-member committee at first voted five-to-four in favor of Shuman, according to the source.

Father Healy asked the committee to continue on page 8.

Clarification

On June 13, the Law Weekly posted a number of flyers around the Law Center giving brief details of the Ritchie and Shuman tenure decisions. In that flyer mention was made of the Law Center and the University Rank and Tenure Committee "granting" tenure. When, in fact, these bodies can only recommend that tenure be given or not given. The URTC decision is independent of the Law Center and cannot "override" it. The Law Weekly did not intend any comparison to be drawn between the Shuman and Ritchie cases.
Geltner to leave Appellate clinic

Law Center Professor Michael E. Geltner has petitioned the Dean to be removed as director of the Appellate Litigation Clinic after the 1977-78 school year. Denial sources say Geltner made the move in response to reports that University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., is considering his delay tenure to the Law Center. Prof. Larry Ritchie, who was to become a co-director of the clinic this coming year, informed Geltner that the school could not afford to lose its most experienced professor. Geltner has been director of the Appellate Litigation Clinic for the two years he has been here and has published many law review articles in that time. He is believed to want out of the clinic so he will be free to write an article before he comes up for tenure consideration.

The Appellate Litigation Clinic itself is in trouble, as its entire program, according to Assoc. Dean John R. Kraner, is about to be restructured. Ritchie is looking for the clinic after the upcoming school year, and the other faculty director of the clinic is Ritchie. If Father Healy sticks to his decision not to grant tenure to Ritchie, fourth floor sources say Ritchie will probably be given a year as a visiting professor here, but no more than that. Thus, the Appellate Litigation Clinic may lose both its faculty directors a year from now.

What's more, Kramer said he is having trouble recruiting faculty for any of the clinics, because of the time and energy it takes to teach in one. "The credits we give for teaching clinics are understated if it's done correctly," Kramer said. There has been concern among upperclassmen for faculty in particular because clinic work is what they can spend writing publishable articles. Ritchie's view about what was he said, Kramer grimly. "The news coming to the other people say, 'I gotta write.'" Kramer added.

"The Ritchie thing is going to have serious repercussions," Kramer said. "The younger folks will write like hell instead of making themselves available to students." Kramer also said Geltner and law center dean David McCarthy declined to comment.

Oldham named to URTC

Law Center Professor James Oldham has been named as the Law Center's temporary new representative to the University Bank and Tenure Committee. He is replacing Prof. Adrian S. Fisher, who has resigned from the Law Center faculty to head the negotiating team at the upcoming Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

Oldham's appointment expires June 30 when all current University committee appointments expire. Oldham has said he does not want to be reappointed for a full one-year term on the committee.

According to Charles Meng, Assistant to President Healy, the committee has been asked to consider making a recommendation that Father Healy grant tenure to Law Center Prof. Jerome Shuman. The committee on two occasions

The Black American Law Students Association (BALSA) issued a statement Wednesday urging University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., to follow the recommendation of the University Bank and Tenure Committee and grant tenure to Law Center Prof. Jerome Shuman.

The BALSA statement claims the Law Center "has demonstrated a complete lack of sensitivity for the significant contributions made to the Law Center community, especially as it relates to its minority and guidance he has provided the minority student population."

The BALSA statement is reprinted in full on page 5.

The BALSA representatives are also waiting to meet personally with Father Healy to discuss tenure for Shuman. A meeting had been scheduled for June 20 but was postponed because Healy was out of town on that date. According to Turner, one of BALSA's two coordinators, Father Healy is waiting for the University Bank and Tenure Committee to reconsider its decision on Shuman and report back before he makes a decision on BALSA.

A delegation consisting of Turner and Larry Frazier, BALSA coordinators, Albert Wynn, BALSA coordinator, and Jose Antonia de la Raza had met with Father Healy on tenure for Shuman at the end of the school year. "I can only say the meeting was informative but unpopular," said Turner. "His final word was that for him to become involved in the tenure process we should get involved in the process and then we would violate the process and possibly violate Prof. Shuman's rights." Turner also said BALSA officers had met with "influential black Georgetown alumni," including D.C. Superior Court Judge Luke Moore, GULC '54, to discuss how to attack the law faculty's negative tenure recommendation and mobilize outside support for Shuman.

Turner said BALSA officers had met with and independently evaluated Shuman before deciding to support him for tenure last fall. "Having black professors for the sake of having black professors does not forward our cause," Turner said.

Turner also noted Shuman had the support of many white students on the student committee on tenure. "We have never had to appeal to white students for support for Prof. Shuman," said Turner, "the only ones we've had to appeal to are the faculty.

Shuman was honored by graduating BALSA members this May for "distinguished service," he had also been honored by BALSA in 1970 for his work as BALSA advisor.

Shuman has opened up his home to students, said Turner, "He's been a student contact and reference person in terms of finding jobs—he has an inordinate number of contacts—and he has tutored students, which is very unusual for a professor." He said Shuman had helped many minority students.

How Wales got his SBA reaaffirms Ritchie support

By Robert Schwaneberg

The Student Bar Association has asked University President Timothy S. Healy, S.J., to reconsider his decision to deny tenure to Prof. Larry Ritchie. A letter from SBA president Wendell C. Robison urging that Father Healy give "due deference" to the favorable report of the Law Center student committee on tenure was delivered to Father Healy Wednesday. (The SBA letter is reprinted on page 5.)

Robison said the SBA has not yet contacted the student committee concerning tenure for Prof. Jerome Shuman, since Healy still has that decision under consideration. But he indicated that he would write a similar letter on behalf of Shuman if Father Healy did not give due consideration to the student committee's favorable report on Shuman.

"We're trying to be advocates for the student position," said Robison. He noted that the Law Center's student committee, on which the student Bar Association is not a voting member, could not make tenure recommendations, voted to grant tenure to both Shuman and Ritchie. "We certainly wouldn't get up there and actively lobby," said Robison, "but if the student Bar Association's student report is not something he should take lightly.

Speaking as a former member of the student tenure committee, Robison said that in view of the high estimation of Ritchie's contribution to the Law Center, he was "sort of outraged" by Healy's decision. Robison wrote the report on Ritchie for the student committee. Robison said he was not surprised, however, by Healy's decision. "I think the report on Ritchie had shown insufficient evidence of scholarship. "I don't think the faculty guidelines are sufficiently clear on what evidence of scholarship means," he said. "I'd like him (Father Healy) to delineate what he means by that.

Robison said he could not really discuss Ritchie's scholarly work since scholarship is considered the "special province of the faculty" and is not studied by the student committee. "We could not evaluate anything he wrote," he said.

Robison also said he had not expected Father Healy to vote in favor of tenure for Shuman and said he hoped the student committee's favorable recommendation had influenced their decision. The student Bar Association voted 6 to 3 to recommend tenure for Shuman.

Benjamin Kudo, who was a member of the student committee for this past year and will be chairman next year, said he was "somewhat surprised" at Healy's decision to deny Ritchie tenure. Although he said he felt the faculty at the Law Center know the professors first-hand and are in a better position to form a sound judgment, Healy may have other reasons for the decision of which he was not aware. Kudo said the student committee's role ended with that submission of its report and it will not make any efforts on behalf of either Shuman or Ritchie. "It's out of our hands," he said.

Other members of the student committee saw the decision as resulting from uneasiness and confusion among untenured faculty members as to what standards are being applied. "There's a growing indication—Ritchie, Shuman, Wales—that there's a difference between what we do at the Law Center and what they're doing at the University Bank and Tenure Committee and President's Office," said one former committee member.
"One of the finest"

To the Editor:
We were shocked and dismayed to learn of President Larry Ritchie's decision to deny tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie.

Professor Ritchie is one of the finest teachers and respected professionals at our university. We are concerned that he will no longer be available to provide the high-quality education that he has provided to our students.

We urge the university to reconsider its decision.

Robert S. Grossman, '78
Jonathan B. Eddison, '79

"Clear direction"

To the Editor:
I wish to express my deep displeasure with Father Healy's decision not to grant tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie. I strongly urge him to reconsider his decision.

We are at a loss to understand Father Healy's decision. He has shown great promise and dedication to the university. He is well-liked by students and faculty alike. It is difficult to understand how he could have made such a decision.

We urge Father Healy to reconsider his decision.

Richard T. Posner, '79

"Dedication"

To the Editor:
I was shocked to learn that President Healy had decided to deny Larry Ritchie tenure. As a former student of Professor Ritchie, I strongly urge him to reconsider his decision.

It is difficult to understand how he could have made such a decision. Professor Ritchie has been a role model for me and many others. He has been a dedicated and professional teacher.

I urge Father Healy to reconsider his decision.

Kenneth M. Rosenzweig, '78

"No $$ for GULC"

To the Editor:
My deep distress over Father Healy's decision to deny tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie of the College of Law is a personal and professional matter. I have been a student at Georgetown for the past three years and have had the pleasure of being one of his students.

Professor Ritchie is a dedicated and professional teacher. His teaching style is unique and engaging. He has always been willing to help his students and has been a role model for me.

I urge Father Healy to reconsider his decision.

Malvina D. Pettersson, '78

"Flyer unjust"

To the Editor:
As a descendant of George Washington, I was upset to learn that the University of Washington was planning to remove his statue from its campus.

I believe that George Washington was a great leader and that his statue should remain on the campus. He was a hero and a symbol of our country's history.

I urge the university to reconsider its decision.

George C. Perry, '78
Professor Jerome Shuman was recommended for tenure by the Student Advisory Committee to the Law Center's Faculty Affairs Committee. The Faculty Affairs Committee as well as the full law faculty voted not to recommend to University President Timothy Healy, S.J., that Prof. Shuman be granted tenure. Using the same information, the University Rank and Tenure Committee (URT) did vote to recommend to Father Healy that Prof. Shuman be given tenure. This Committee re-pooled its members with the resulting vote being 6-4 in favor of recommending tenure for Prof. Shuman. Each time the Law Center's representative to the URTC voted for recommending tenure for Prof. Shuman.

Facing this totally opposite recommendations, Father Healy asked the URTC to reconsider, for a second time, its decision to recommend tenure for Prof. Shuman. The URTC has considered Prof. Shuman's case, made a recommendation and presented Father Healy with its reasons for that recommendation. The Law Center's tenured faculty similarly has acted, giving Father Healy two reasoned analyses for the decision whether or not to tenure Prof. Shuman. It would seem, therefore, that no facts remain to be discovered, making a second reconsideration by the URTC unnecessary.

Plan must be made for the future, and to have delayed to the very end of June a decision that should have been made earlier is a disservice to the Law Center, its students, and to Prof. Shuman. To further procrastinate by referring the case to the URTC for a third consideration is unwise.

We do not put much stock in the theory that Father Healy's request for further URTC consideration is a hint that to Committee to change its vote. With this interpretation may come to many minds. Our disbelief is grounded in the Ritchie lesson, where Father Healy not only went against the recommendation of the URTC but also against that of the Law faculty. Nor do we believe the theory that Prof. Ritchie's denial of tenure for lack of scholarship was a step in a plan to deny tenure to Prof. Shuman and see against him his lack of work published while at the Law Center. We believe that the decisions whether to tenure the two individuals were made separately and independently, and can only be analyzed in that manner.

Since Father Healy has delayed his consideration of Prof. Shuman in an attempt to solicit further information, we recommend to his attention the following items regarding Prof. Shuman:

—He has support among non-minority and among minority students at the Law Center.

—He has received low ratings in student course evaluations with the exception of a few courses, notably Antitrust.

—He has been praised as being a very receptive and caring person, even in the student evaluations that did not rate his teaching very high in favor of recommending tenure for Prof. Shuman. Each time the Law Center's representative to the URTC voted for recommending tenure for Prof. Shuman.

—He is the minority professor who is actively involved in aiding minority students at the Law Center.

—A massive article of his, shortly to appear in the Tennessee Law Journal is his first publication since 1971.

—There are no tenured minority professors and only two other minority associate professors, besides Shuman, teaching here.

University President Healy's apparent decision not to grant tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie for lack of substantial evidence of scholarship is an affront to the law faculty, law students, and to basic concepts of due process.

Prof. Ritchie was unanimously recommended for tenure by the Student Advisory Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee; by a two-to-one margin by the law faculty; and by a nine-to-zero vote, with four abstentions, by the University Rank and Tenure Committee (URT). All four groups reviewed Prof. Ritchie's qualifications carefully and concluded that he possessed sufficient teaching ability and evidence of scholarship to warrant conferring tenure upon him. Father Healy's decision not to accept this unanimous recommendation for tenure was improper and should be reconsidered.

Unlike the circumstances surrounding Professor Jerome Shuman, every committee reviewing Prof. Ritchie recommended him for tenure. At no point did the reviewing bodies consider that Prof. Ritchie's brief to the Supreme Court in United States v. Hale and his recent article in the Minnesota Law Review failed to evidence substantial scholarship. Although the fact that Father Healy is not a lawyer does not automatically disqualify him from having the expertise to competently judge the scholarship of a legal brief or of a law review article, it is clear that legal scholarship differs from other forms of academic scholarship. In these circum-
stances, the evaluation by lawyers of legal material should be accorded substantial weight and deference.

It should be noted that Prof. Ritchie's tenure case is the first involving a professor specifically hired to teach clinics. It also should be noted that Associate Dean Frank Flegel's sole evidence of scholarship was his brief to the Supreme Court in the Palmore case. It is unfair to hold Prof. Ritchie to standards of scholarship (1) which were not applied in the past; (2) of which he had no notice and (3) which do not take into account the demands made upon clinical professors that are in addition to those made upon regular professors. Father Healy's action does not comport with basic concepts of fairness and should be reconsidered.

In denying tenure to Prof. Ritchie, Father Healy also has undermined the Law Center's clinical program, the major source of GULC's national recognition. This decision should be reconsidered before serious damage is done to the Law Center and its students.

In denying Prof. Ritchie tenure on the basis of lack of scholarship, Father Healy misconstrued the nature and function of the Law Center and that of the clinical programs in which Prof. Ritchie was involved. There is an inherent difference between a clinical legal program and any other scholastic course or program. The latter principally have an intellectual and academic orient-
tion. The former is the application of the academically and intellectually, but not yet in.

Father Healy has derided the Law Center as a mere an.

Pro. Larry Ritchie

University President Healy's apparent decision not to grant tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie for lack of substantial evidence of scholarship is an affront to the law faculty, law students, and to basic concepts of due process.

Prof. Ritchie was unanimously recommended for tenure by the Student Advisory Committee and the Faculty Affairs Committee; by a two-to-one margin by the law faculty; and by a nine-to-zero vote, with four abstentions, by the University Rank and Tenure Committee (URT). All four groups reviewed Prof. Ritchie's qualifications carefully and concluded that he possessed sufficient teaching ability and evidence of scholarship to warrant conferring tenure upon him. Father Healy's decision not to accept this unanimous recommendation for tenure was improper and should be reconsidered.

Unlike the circumstances surrounding Professor Jerome Shuman, every committee reviewing Prof. Ritchie recommended him for tenure. At no point did the reviewing bodies consider that Prof. Ritchie's brief to the Supreme Court in United States v. Hale and his recent article in the Minnesota Law Review failed to evidence substantial scholarship. Although the fact that Father Healy is not a lawyer does not automatically disqualify him from having the expertise to competently judge the scholarship of a legal brief or of a law review article, it is clear that legal scholarship differs from other forms of academic scholarship. In these cir-

The Georgetown Law Weekly is published on Mondays during school years. Permission to reprint any part must be obtained in writing from the Law Weekly prior to publication. Entire contents copyright 1977 by the Georgetown Law Weekly.

Special Correspondents

Michael Gross, David McCabe
We feel that candidates for tenure should be evaluated fairly according to the standards and procedures for all University faculty members, not just by the recommendations of the Law faculty.

Prof. Shuman and supportive of Professor Ritchie. Again, we do not question the worthiness of Professor Ritchie or Professor Shuman, but do question the process. The University Law faculty when making a tenure decision for a Law Center candidate, and that this practice should be applied to both Ritchie and Shuman. We feel that candidates for tenure should be evaluated fairly according to the standards and procedures (including the appeals process) for all University faculty members.

—President Healy has agreed to give the Law Center tenured faculty members an audience with him to discuss the Ritchie decision. This action seems to be prejudicial to Professor Shuman when his tenure decision is pending. This belief is based on the fact that no assurances exist that Professor Shuman's case will not be the subject of discussion whether directly or indirectly. BALSA supports the candidacy for tenure for Professor Shuman without reservation. Our support is not solely for reasons of discipline but for reasons of professional integrity.

As minority students, we would have the most to lose if an unqualified minority professor were tenured. This is not the case here and we support tenure for Professor Shuman without reservation.

Wendell C. Robinson, President, GULC-SBA
More Letters to the Editor

continued from page 3

succeeds, takes the administrative branch of the University.

While I first emphasize that the tenure question of Prof. Shuman is not and should not be related to the Ritchie case. The circumstances are completely different and any attempt to draw a relationship other than "time" is unwarranted.

Since I have not had any exposure to Prof. Ritchie, I cannot comment on his teaching ability, but I will say that procedures for tenure granting and denial should be definite, specific, and clear, with an adequate appeal process. Due process will settle for nothing less.

Jerome Shuman’s situation is entirely different. I have had the opportunity of learning Corporations from him, and on the basis of that experience I would strongly urge that he be granted tenure. Prof. Shuman is eminently qualified, graduating from Yale Law School and having previous teaching experience at Howard University School of Law. While I do not consider him one of the star performers of the faculty, he is certainly no worse than many tenured professors and better than many.

While the reasons some of the law school tenure committee did not support him, and the reasons most of the university committee did, are unclear and probably will never be known or understood, the reaction of some of the law school community has been to see the question as one of Black v. White. While the motivation behind those decisions, the real problem seems to have gone unacknowledged, specific personalities and a strong administration.

By this I mean no one particular segment of the University community should be controlling. Such a decision should be arrived at on the basis of Law Center input, including equal weight given to student input, i.e., the story of the student, professional input. A committee composed of representatives from each group should be constituted, with the final determination with of course an adequate appeal process.

This may be the ideal solution but my point is that the decision should not be made by one person. I find the buck-passing presently going on particularly pernicious.

Because of the delicacy of the situation I can understand Father Healy’s reluctance of taking the ball himself, but perhaps he sees now that he should never have been placed in that situation anyway.

Robert N. Davis, ’78

Shuman sensitive

To the Editor:

This past year, I had the extreme pleasure of having Jerome Shuman as a professor in my Excommunications I class. His worthwhile presentations always clarified the legal material and made class more interesting. Although many students may have complained of his teaching approach, his in-depth knowledge and understanding of the law was always prevalent. His conferences certainly surpasses many of the professors I have experienced while at Georgetown Law Center.

Prof. Shuman offers Georgetown Law Center a quality rarely found in law school professors—sensitivity to students. It is the kind of sensitivity that avoids an atmosphere of unnecessary pressure, which often makes the learning process very tenious.

Furthermore, in considering the need for a more diversified faculty and administration, I hope a closer look is taken at his involvement in student activities and his scholastic achievements. He has been very encouraging to many of us who aspire to become well skilled and highly respected amongst our constituents in the legal profession.

Cecile A. Vaughters, ’79

Primarily educator

To the Editor:

I am outraged at Father Healy’s decision to blacklist Larry J. Ritchie. First, his decision shows no regard for the decisions of the Law Center and the university tenure committee which approved Prof. Ritchie for tenure.

Second, on the merits of the issue, I feel Prof. Ritchie is an outstanding educator. There is no doubt he is very competent in his teaching, but it is not his teaching. The question here is whether the faculty and students, on the basis of all available evidence, consider him worth the price. The answer is yes, he is valuable to the students and the community.

For me, the professor makes the course. I frankly do not care whether he is a respected author or of national prominence in the field. If he be competent and passionate, I am satisfied. What is important is that the students learn something. In this situation, as far as I am concerned, the record is clear.

“Scholarship,” as Father Healy calls it, and prominence perhaps can substitute for teaching ability where the latter is seriously lacking, but I doubt that it should override teaching ability and confidence. One factor which seems to be ignored too often in an educational institution is that the professors are primarily educators and authors only secondarily.

I respect Larry Ritchie as a professor and I like him as a person. It would be a terrible disservice to the Law Center if he could not return next year. And Father Healy wonders why alumni contributions are low.

Hester H. Honda, ’78

Unfortunate timing

To the Editor:

Father Healy should reconsider his decision denying tenure to Professor Larry Ritchie. The timing of this decision is most unfortunate. Prof. Ritchie has strong support among the student body, as I am sure you realize from the large student demonstration. Had Father Healy made his decision known while school was in session, the full magnitude of our support for Prof. Ritchie would have been evident.

Any academic institution, especially a profession school, can only benefit from a faculty with a variety of backgrounds and interests. Abstract scholarship and practical experience are both important. If Father Healy continues to develop what appears to be a very narrow definition of legal scholarship, Georgetown will end up with a very one-dimensional faculty. Without denying the importance of research and scholarship I would like to remind him that the primary purpose of a school is to teach students. To deny a professor who has proven his ability to teach is surely counter-productive.

Andrea W. Selvaggio, ’78

Subtle alignment

To the Editor:

I had seen several of your notices around the Law Center, and at first had read only the handwritten headlines. After I saw them a sixth or seventh, I became curious about the body of information beneath Larry Ritchie’s name, so I stopped and read the notice in its entirety. My impression, and that of my colleagues, was that the notice is an example of the image of a professor, and not of the true image. If it is a reflection of the teaching abilities of the Law Center faculty and the University, I do not understand you—indeed, I understand it better than you do.

My comment is supported by the comments of those who have written letters to the editor, as well as the mention of efforts being recognized in the headliners. In contrast, your remarks concerning Prof. Shuman are off-hand, as though the matter of his tenure is of less importance than the tenure of a student body. I have always had to deal with this pattern throughout the years. This form of treatment only supports the image of the student body— the lack of minority professors at G.U.L.C. enhances this dilemma even more.

Some white professors are receptive to minority students but quite frankly, the majority are not and this insensitivity must be compensated for. Given the makeup of the minority student body—the law school should make a serious attempt at becoming more reflective of this.

Prof. Shuman’s scholarship is without question. He has had to teach couresdishes that other professors at the Law School never had to teach. He has had to work his way to meet with students and discuss their problems.

continued from page 7

Black face

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter in regard to Father Healy’s proposal of tenure for Prof. Ritchie. I will not discuss Prof. Ritchie’s qualifications or the implications of the reversal of a tenure decision by the University and the University Rank and Tenure Committee. I am sure he has been insulted by such letters.

I would just like to ask Father Healy not to permit his pride to prevent him from reversing his proposed denial of tenure. It would just be a personal decision, not the decision of the University. He would, but gives grace to the humble." (James 4:6; 1 Peter 5:5)

Lori Mayer, ’79

Inprovement action

To the Editor:

As editor of the American Criminal Law Review and as a student at the Law Center I want to express my shock at the denial of tenure to Prof. Ritchie. I know that those of us at the Review who have been fortunate enough to have had a course with Prof. Ritchie are at a loss to explain Father Healy’s decision.

Prof. Ritchie is an outstanding teacher. He effectively communicates to his students the solid understanding of the criminal law. Those who have not yet taken a course from Prof. Ritchie are the real losers. They will miss out on his first-hand knowledge of the law, his concern for their needs, and his classroom manner which is intricate, scholarly and yet informal enough so that students actually look forward to attending his sessions. I urge Father Healy to reconsider his improvidence action.

Robert G. Seldenstein Editor-in-Chief

American Criminal Law Review

Grace to the humble

To the Editor:

I am writing this letter in regard to Father Healy’s proposed denial of tenure to Prof. Ritchie. I will not discuss Prof. Ritchie’s qualifications or the implications of the reversal of a tenure decision by the University and the University Rank and Tenure Committee. I am sure he has been insulted by such letters.

I would just like to ask Father Healy not to permit his pride to prevent him from reversing his proposed denial of tenure. It would just be a personal decision, not the decision of the University. He would, but gives grace to the humble." (James 4:6; 1 Peter 5:5)

Lori Mayer, ’79

Inprovement action

To the Editor:

As editor of the American Criminal Law Review and as a student at the Law Center I want to express my shock at the denial of tenure to Prof. Ritchie. I know that those of us at the Review who have been fortunate enough to have had a course with Prof. Ritchie are at a loss to explain Father Healy’s decision.

Prof. Ritchie is an outstanding teacher. He effectively communicates to his students the solid understanding of the criminal law. Those who have not yet taken a course from Prof. Ritchie are the real losers. They will miss out on his first-hand knowledge of the law, his concern for their needs, and his classroom manner which is intricate, scholarly and yet informal enough so that students actually look forward to attending his sessions. I urge Father Healy to reconsider his improvidence action.

Robert G. Seldenstein Editor-in-Chief

American Criminal Law Review

White faces

To the Editor:

Father Healy’s decision regarding tenure for Prof. Shuman should not be formulized without the realization of what is involved.

One of the most noticeable things to a minority student like myself coming to Georgetown is the concentration of white students and the lack of black student. I have always had to deal with this pattern throughout the years spent in institutions of higher learning. Perhaps Father Healy has heard this before, but he will hear it again. Alienation does much to make an adjustment to law school more difficult.

The lack of minority professors at G.U.L.C. enhances this dilemma even more.

Some white professors are receptive to minority students but quite frankly, the majority are not and this insensitivity must be compensated for. Given the makeup of the minority student body—the law school should make a serious attempt at becoming more reflective of this.

Prof. Shuman’s scholarship is without question. He has had to teach courses and that other professors at the Law School never had to teach. He has had to work his way to meet with students and discuss their problems.

continued from page 7

BALS statement

continued from page 5

black lawyers. Professor Shuman’s service to the community adds to Georgetown’s fulfillment of its obligations to the Community and to prove himself from its worthwhile role will certainly create an obvious void in the relationship.

Professor Shuman is not just another professor or just another black professor; he is a competent legal educator and lawyer. He is respected by other law schools in the field and is seen as a model by many other minority legal educators who have just been given the opportunity to “congregate” at other law centers. A decision not to tenure him will have an adverse impact on the treatment and attitudes of minority faculty members at other law schools as well as Georgetown’s ability to attract other competent minority professors. We must be ever mindful of the conditions and circumstances that Professor Shuman has to Georgetown under, and therefore due consideration should be given to this factor. Affirmative action programs were just as cogent to play a part in beginning the influx of major institutions. Georgetown certainly did not compromise quality when it appointed Professor Shuman. We feel that Georgetown’s responsibility for affirmative action is still present and necessary. We are not suggesting tokenism or token evidence for the Law Center, but feel that Professor Shuman qualifies on the merits for tenure.
More letters—continued from page 6

Healy cites weak writing by Ritchie—continued from page 1

Students with problems faced on entering law school were someone they found approachable and easy to associate with. “He did not try to impress us with his credentials or with his wealth,” Turner said.

Then there was the energy gap he noticed in his class. “There was a lot of faculty members who didn’t know Jerry Shahman,” rustic Turner said.

——Robert Schwaner
Fisher leaves; becomes arms control chief

Professor Adrian S. Fisher has been appointed head of the American negotiating team at the upcoming Conference on Disarmament. The appointment was confirmed by the U.S. Senate on May 25, 1977. Fisher will have the rank of ambassador. Fisher was head of the American delegation when the talks were last held in 1969.

The appointment was announced to the Law Center at graduation ceremonies on May 25. Fisher will occupy the Brown chair, the position vacated by Fisher. The Brown chair was named for Judge David J. McCarthy Jr., no action is underway to find a new professor for the Francis Cabot Brown professorship in international law, the position vacated by Fisher. The Brown chair is named for the Brown college student who was elected acting president of the American Petroleum Institute in 1972.

The search for a new occupant for the chair will be "a long range. Nothing specific for the search or hiring of a new chairholder has been discussed as yet. No decision will be made before the start of this school year and probably none will be made for at least a year," Meng said.

Fisher resigned from the Law Center faculty and has been replaced on the committee, until June 30, by Law Center Prof. James Oldham. Oldham has not said how he will vote or what he will say in the URTC meeting, scheduled for Friday, June 24.

Shuman joined the Law Center faculty in 1969 after being a member of the Howard Law School faculty for five years. He took a leave of absence from Georgetown from 1971 to 1974 to direct the Office of Equal Opportunity at the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. While there he had responsibility for establishment of the now-defunct Development of Administration programs in the area of anti-discrimination.

Shuman has taught a number of different courses at the Law Center, including Antitrust, Corporations, Insolvency, Legal Accounting, Property, Business Planning, and Registered Industries.

In recent years he has had a heavy teaching load. Nevertheless the student tenure committee praised him for his willingness to meet with students and help them individually. His efforts in this area formed the basis for the Law Center's first-year tutorial program.

While at Howard Shuman published several articles on trade regulation, franchising, and black capitalism. He also served as director of a research project on the economic status of black lawyers in America. After Shuman came to Georgetown he published "A Black Lawyer's Study" in 1971. Shuman has a new article, application of the Antitrust Law to Regulated Industries, scheduled to appear in the most recent issue of the Tennessee Law Review, which is the leading law review of Tennessee. Shuman, a former editor of the Tennessee Law Review, is a leading lawyer in Tennessee. Shuman is the former Law Review editor in law and poor housing.

He is also a former editor of the Tennessee Law Review and the Tennessee Law Review. Shuman is the former Law Review editor in law and poor housing.

The mean average in Spring '76 for all professors in all courses was 3.85.

Shuman continues from page 1

members to again vote, apparently refusing to accept the decision contrary to the Law Center faculty's vote. The committee responded by voting six to one to accept Shuman, the source said.

Shuman serves as law school president, to the University President, Healy sent the case back to the URTC, which decided that the vote of one member of the committee was invalid.

The committee decided to reject the recommendation.

The following are the mean averages of student evaluations of Prof. Jerome Shuman on question 27 on the GULC faculty evaluations.

"The teaching approach of the professor was helpful to my learning experience." (strongly disagree; strongly agree)

Spring '75
Antitrust
4.00
Insurance
3.72
Fall '76
Property
3.90
Spring '76
Accounting, Sec. 1
3.33
Legal Accounting, Sec. 5
3.25
Property
4.87

The mean average in Spring '76 for all professors in all courses was 3.85.

D.C. Bar postpones change in waive-in rule

The D.C. Court of Appeals has ordered that, effective April 1, 1978, new attorneys who are admitted to the D.C. Bar in other states will no longer be able to gain admission to the D.C. Bar without taking the D.C. Bar examination unless they have practiced in their home state for a number of years, generally five.

Under the existing rules governing "waive-in," as an admission by motion, the D.C. Bar is known, new attorneys may waive into the D.C. Bar after graduating from an accredited law school and passing another state's Bar exam. The new attorney must have been a resident of the state where he or she took the Bar exam for six months before taking the exam. The Court of Appeals has ordered that this provision, D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 46 (c) (3), be vacated in its entirety, effective April 1, 1978.

To "waive-in" under the old rule, applicants must be admitted to state bar and have their applications on file with the D.C. Court of Appeals by March 31, 1978. The Court had been expected to make the rules change effective January 1, 1978, but according to Chief Judge Theodore Newman, the effective date was postponed when it was learned that Bar exam results would not be in for all states by the end of the year.

"What we were trying to do was to prepare the admission of attorneys in the state in which they practiced to be in D.C. But we were concerned about the fact that some of the results would not be in on time," said Judge Newman. "The most we can do is to have the exam results in on time and then we can make the rule change effective.

Students who take and pass New York's Bar exam this summer will not be sworn in to the New York Bar until January, Newman said the D.C. Court of Appeals postponed the change in its rules until the end of March to be "effected and made sure that everyone who takes the exam this summer can waive in.

D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 46 (c) (3) still permits attorneys to waive in to D.C. after practicing in another state for five years. A recent change in that rule permits members of out-of-state Bar to waive in to D.C. with less than the presently required five years practice experience if their home states would allow D.C. attorneys to waive in to their states with an equal number of years experience.

The change is effective January 1, 1978.

Rec-plex to break ground soon

Georgetown has announced plans to build a recreation complex on the Main Campus. According to a University announcement, the complex will be used for athletics and for $6 million and will be financed by a bond loan and alumni contributions.

The University expects to break ground for the complex, which will be located underground next to the present gym, in June. However, at least, no work has begun.

Students will be charged a $60 activity fee once the structure is open. The plan and student fees were approved in a campus-wide vote last year. The faculty was overwhelmingly on the Main Campus but passed the Law Center by a narrow margin.

The complex is expected to be completed by November of 1978. It is not known at this time if the complex will be opened to the general public or if it will be open only to students of the Law Center. The University is concerned about the cost of facility use to the general public and the lack of demand for such services.

Harvardization on the cheap'

evaluations of Ritchie's article done by non-Georgetown law professors and by professors and practitioners outside the University.

According to the University, one of the reasons for the delay was the lack of interest among Law Center students about the lack of facilities available to them and the lack of demand for such services.

"Harvardization on the cheap' continued from page 1
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