Lerner's and GULC Debate 'The Facts'

By TIM MAGUIRE

This article is the second of a two-part story concerning the controversy between the GULC Bookshop and the Lerner Law Bookstore. Last week's segment presented the basic positions of both sides. In this week's installment, the focus is directed more towards 'the numbers.'

Last September, upon the opening of the GULC Bookshop, the Lerner Law Bookstore released a handout to all students purporting to disclose that the new competitor was charging over the suggested list price on a number of textbooks and related materials. The list contained thirteen books, alleging excessive markups ranging from 40 cents to $11.20 per book. Upon the advent of the spring semester, Lerner's alleged that the Bookshop lowered its prices to list upon being caught. Now, Lerner's is alleging that there are a number of books now being underpriced by the Bookshop. Lerner's contends the underpricing is being kept under wraps because GULC does not offer such discounts at either their Main Campus or Med/Deans' Depository.

Ron Duvall, the University Bookshop Director, sharply denies these allegations. In reference to overpricing, Duvall claims, "We know Lerner's existed. It would make no sense for us to raise prices." On the current charge of discounting, he adds, "Why would we make the prices lower? Don't you think we'd put that out on the street? If we're going to have lower prices, we'll let the students know. It's Lerner's that advertises they have the lowest prices in the country."

Apparently, some books have been sold at slightly less than list price. However, Andre Thompson, manager of the bookshop, states that the Bookshop ordered this year's texts so that they would be available in July and that by doing so they may have avoided some price increases by the publishers. He asserts, "Some of the prices may be higher now. But we only charge the students the suggested list price." Jim Conway, owner of Lerner's refutes this contention stating that some of these books weren't available until August.

Printed at the bottom of this page is the list of last fall's disputed books. The left column presents what Conway claims are the suggested list prices, the middle column are what he asserts GULC charged last September, and the right column are the prices which Thompson states were actually charged. As can be observed, the prices are all around the board. Thompson claims that Conway's price list is inaccurate. Some prices, such as that for Petr, are higher, but he asserts that those are the invoice prices. Some books, such as Eskridge's book on Legislation, though, are sold below Conway's prices. Upon calling the West Publishing Company, it was ascertained that the list price was actually $10.95 on the Federal Rules of Evidence. If so, then continued on page 8

In response to requests by the Black Law Students Association (BLSA) and other student groups, GULC has canceled Baker & McKenzie's interview at the Georgetown Law Center.

The student groups asked the university to take this action due to racial slurs uttered by a member of the firm at an interview at the University of Chicago last year. Four schools—the University of Chicago, Stanford, N.Y.U., and the University of California at Berkeley—already suspended Baker & McKenzie for one year, but Georgetown is the first school to act since the law firm made public an extensive equal employment program.

While over six months separated the event and recent calls for suspension at Georgetown, events moved quickly following this. On September 1, BLSA members placed a flyer detailing their complaints about the firm in student folders. On September 7, BLSA sent a letter to Dean Abbie Thorner at the Office of Career Services, urging the university to retract the invitation to Baker & McKenzie. Thorner responded that the firm was not noncommittal, but that a September 12 meeting of the Law Center Placement Committee, it was decided to suspend the firm to page 3 for a report of this meeting.

This decision, one week prior to the firm's scheduled interview, created debate and controversy at the Law Center. Neither the meeting of the Law Center Placement Committee nor the possibility of suspending Baker & McKenzie was widely publicized to the general student population. Although careful to deploy the racial incidents which gave rise to the incident, students who were denied interviews with the firm due to the suspension typically remarked that the Law Center's action seemed "underhanded" and "behind the back."

Juliette Ava Williams, president of BLSA, stated her sorrow for the inconvenience caused to students who lost interview opportunities, but stated that failure to address the issue would be condemning Baker & McKenzie's actions. On the day following the meeting she stated her hope that the Office of Career Services would recompense those students harmed. She also placed the blame for the unfortunate timing with Thorner's office for originally failing to respond to the racial slurs last academic year. Members of other organizations affirmed that, contrary to what the Law Weekly implied last week, they addressed their concerns in the wake of the original incident. Dean Abbie Thorner denies the issue was brought to his attention last year. She fiilly stated in her letter to student groups that she and her staff "sought the advice and involvement of some of the signing organizations on at least five separate occasions last spring." "I shared the students' sense of outrage over the original incident," she recently said, "but in the face of Baker & McKenzie's remedial efforts, I felt it was in all the students best interests to continue to work with the firm to improve the situation."

Attempts to address the poor timing of the Baker & McKenzie action were not limited to student groups or the Office of Career Services. The Office of the Dean, in a statement explaining its position, attributed the lapse of the decision to "the academic calendar and the recent change of deans which presented the very strong views that exist here." Dean Arent's letter also asserted that she wished to "reaffirm that Georgetown will not tolerate unlawful discrimination."

Shuttle Service Imminent

In the near future, GULC will begin a full-time shuttle service from McDonough Hall to the Union Station Metro Center. The shuttle route will also include stops at the Law Center Library and 25 E. Street. It will initially operate from 4 p.m. until midnight.

Law Center officials are hopeful that a shuttle will enhance the security of university students during the night-time university-connected travel. Concern about safety has been an impediment to students who wished to study or otherwise work at the Law Center in the evening.

The shuttle, which will provide transportation to students and other members of the university without charge, will operate in addition to the GUTS bus, which will continue its regular run from the Law Center to the Main Campus. School officials have not yet finalized the schedule for route and say that weekend service is possible if a sufficient number of drivers exists.

University students are being sought as drivers for the shuttle service. A valid District of Columbia driver's license is needed for the position which will pay $8.00 an hour. Interested students should call Bob Beggio at 682-9048.
Letters To The Editor:

Suspension of Baker & McKenzie: A Step in Wrong Direction

At the outset, I wish to make very clear that my purpose is not to encourage or in any way promote division or friction within the GULC community. My sincere and fervent hope is that this editorial in no way leads to that result. Rather, I simply wish to express my viewpoint concerning the banning of Baker & McKenzie from the on-campus interview program this year. As members of a legal community, we should all be particularly tolerant of differing ideas and should not misinterpret them to mean anything other than a difference of opinion. After all, we are all colleagues.

Second, I only wish to be addressed concerning the recent antithetical action of B&M’s invitation. The urgency behind the decision has Old Schoolers’ marks is, or should be, undisputed. His questions to Ma. Golden were recent and sensibly made and showed a complete lack of professionalism, class, and decorum. As repugnant and intolerable as this act is to all law students, it is not fair to brand an entire organization as racist and punish that firm because of the actions of one partner in one office. B&M has offices all over the world and several of those offices (separate from the Chicago office) were going to interview here at GULC.

The unfairness and counterproductivity of this suspension becomes even more apparent when one looks at the steps B&M has taken in response to the Golden interview. B&M has responded admirably in the areas of minority recruiting and hiring by establishing a $500,000 minority scholarship fund ($15,000 of which will go to GULC students this year) and by making available sensitivity training programs to its entire staff. Furthermore, Mr. O’Kane has accepted an early retirement, a clear indication to all B&M employees that prejudicial practices will not be tolerated. A point that has been advanced in favor of the suspension is that it is a means of discouraging other law firms from engaging in this sort of behavior. However, the negative publicity generated by the legal community’s outrage over Mr. O’Kane’s questions and B&M’s actions in response to this condemnation is accomplishing this already.

The solution is not to ban B&M. Instead, the goal should be to create a legal culture in which this kind of incident is not even a possibility and the most prudent and fair means to achieve this is by coordinating the efforts of law schools, law institutions, and the firms themselves. Ironically, the message GULC has sent by suspending B&M a week before it was scheduled to interview is that GULC wants to make an example of B&M (as a grade school teacher would do with a troublesome student) and is not willing to work with B&M (at least not this year) to insure that all law students receive fair and equal treatment at employment interviews.

In addition, GULC’s facilities and resources are intended for and are being drawn down, not just a segment thereof, as well as other students, had made a conscious decision to interview with B&M and an absence of choice should have been respected, at least, un Very troubling that the decision to rescind B&M’s invitation was made without consulting those students who had a direct stake in this determination. Finally, if the goal is to increase the opportunities for minorities in a firm practice, then the banning of B&M is not even a possibility and the most prudent and fair means to achieve this is by coordinating the efforts of law schools, law institutions, and the firms themselves. Ironically, the message GULC has sent by suspending B&M a week before it was scheduled to interview is that GULC wants to make an example of B&M (as a grade school teacher would do with a troublesome student) and is not willing to work with B&M (at least not this year) to insure that all law students receive fair and equal treatment at employment interviews.

In addition, GULC’s facilities and resources are intended for and are being drawn down, not just a segment thereof, as well as other students, had made a conscious decision to interview with B&M and an absence of choice should have been respected, at least, un Very troubling that the decision to rescind B&M’s invitation was made without consulting those students who had a direct stake in this determination. Finally, if the goal is to increase the opportunities for minorities in a firm practice, then the banning of B&M is not even a possibility and the most prudent and fair means to achieve this is by coordinating the efforts of law schools, law institutions, and the firms themselves. Ironically, the message GULC has sent by suspending B&M a week before it was scheduled to interview is that GULC wants to make an example of B&M (as a grade school teacher would do with a troublesome student) and is not willing to work with B&M (at least not this year) to insure that all law students receive fair and equal treatment at employment interviews.

In addition, GULC’s facilities and resources are intended for and are being drawn down, not just a segment thereof, as well as other students, had made a conscious decision to interview with B&M and an absence of choice should have been respected, at least, un Very troubling that the decision to rescind B&M’s invitation was made without consulting those students who had a direct stake in this determination. Finally, if the goal is to increase the opportunities for minorities in a firm practice, then the banning of B&M is not even a possibility and the most prudent and fair means to achieve this is by coordinating the efforts of law schools, law institutions, and the firms themselves. Ironically, the message GULC has sent by suspending B&M a week before it was scheduled to interview is that GULC wants to make an example of B&M (as a grade school teacher would do with a troublesome student) and is not willing to work with B&M (at least not this year) to insure that all law students receive fair and equal treatment at employment interviews.

In addition, GULC’s facilities and resources are intended for and are being drawn down, not just a segment thereof, as well as other students, had made a conscious decision to interview with B&M and an absence of choice should have been respected, at least, un Very troubling that the decision to rescind B&M’s invitation was made without consulting those students who had a direct stake in this determination. Finally, if the goal is to increase the opportunities for minorities in a firm practice, then the banning of B&M is not even a possibility and the most prudent and fair means to achieve this is by coordinating the efforts of law schools, law institutions, and the firms themselves. Ironically, the message GULC has sent by suspending B&M a week before it was scheduled to interview is that GULC wants to make an example of B&M (as a grade school teacher would do with a troublesome student) and is not willing to work with B&M (at least not this year) to insure that all law students receive fair and equal treatment at employment interviews.
Code Critical is in Effect

By TIM MAGURE

Georgetown Law Center will on Monday join fourteen law schools across the nation in participating in the Code Critical program. Code Critical, as has been defined in previous Law Weekly editorials, is a widely-touted program to raise funds for homeless students.

Participating in Code Critical is simplicity itself. Students interviewing with law firms stay at less expensive hotels and eat at less expensive restaurants. In addition, participation in the program is automatically the result of the use of a designated travel agent, Lawyers Travel Agency.

Code Critical originated at Harvard Law School in reaction to the discrepancy between accommodations of interviewation law students and the stark problems of the homeless. From spacious quarters at Embassy Suites Hotel in Washington to luxurious surroundings at Sheraton Grand in Los Angeles, the nation's best law schools have been offered increasingly lavish perks during the 1980s as competition for the best minds has intensified. Robert Haynes, counsel to the National Coalition for the Homeless, has called Code Critical "a great" because "students and firms are acknowledging that there are these two Americas."

Steven Nevesmith, president of the SBA, says that the response of the student body to the program has been one of enthusiasm and excitement. Members of the Journal of Legal Ethics have offered to staff the tables at which students will sign up to participate. SBA members Grace Ann Stafford, Dan Foreman, John Korn, Steve Leff, and Shelley Peterson have logged long hours so that this initial year of the program will run as smoothly as possible.

Students participating in the program are not subject to low-quality service during their interview trips. For lunch, the student firms generally spend approximately twenty-five dollars per person. Under Code Critical, they will spend ten to fifteen dollars. At the usual three-person lunch, this modest student, in turn, is a minority student in bioscience law firms. BLM has taken concrete steps in this direction. While we should not be completely satisfied with the measures already undertaken, we should encourage and work with firms such as BLM (rather than fight them) in order to continue improving the situation.

Ms. Golden's characterization of BLM's programs as "a happy ending to what started as a very unhappy affair" should be applauded as it demonstrates the kind of positive attitude we should adopt.

Ang Felix Le, Jr. ZL
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Ban Vote Carries

By FRANCISCO LOPEZ

On Tuesday, Sept. 12, the GULC Faculty/Student Placement Committee, after a day and a half-hour meeting with various student groups, voted five to two to recommend to Dean Justin Areen that the law firm of Baker & McKenzie be banned from this year's interview season. By Wednesday morning, the firm's invitation had 12-evoked and students formed the cancellation. The action comes as a result of an incident of Chicago last winter and the subsequent lobbying of the letter demanding a ban by at least nine student groups.

Present at Tuesday's meeting were official committee members: Jack Murphy, Chair; Peter Edelman; Abbie Thornoff; Emma Jordan; Steve McKenzie; and the Student Bar Association president acting as student representative pro tem. Also present were: Juliette Williams, Black Law Students' Association president; representatives of BLSA, Asian and Pacific-American Law Students' Association (APALSA), Equal Justice Foundation (EJF), National Lawyers' Guild (NLG), Jewish Law Students' Association (JLSA), and the Lesbian and Gay Association.

Although the events leading to the meeting created notable tension between the students and the administration, the committee's Chair, Jack Murphy, was able to diffuse most of the confrontational atmosphere and promote a clear discussion of the issues and the consequences of a ban.

Initially, a majority of the committee felt hesitant to ban Baker & McKenzie. "at the eleventh hour." Some felt the focus should be on prospective procedures that address discrimination in Baker & McKenzie's interviewing and hiring practices. Professor Emma Jordan, a representative of the AALS, also said she found herself at the "bvil eye" of the controversy and felt that the committee should be looking at long-term solutions to discriminatory hiring practices, not just in regards to race, but also to gender and sexual orientation.

Other committee members voiced concern at whether banning would really help, given that the SBA is limited in its ability to improve its image by hiring minority students this year. Some BLSA members supported the position, saying that even if this year's hiring demonstrated "tokenism," it would ensure minorities being hired. Marilyn Tucker, Director of Career Services, said that only two students had crossed out Baker & McKenzie from the Clerkship Interview list. She saw this as an indication that minority students were not interested in interviewing there. It was pointed out, however, that the instructions only said to "circle your top two choices" and not to cross out objectionable firms.

There was also discussion as to whether banning the entire firm was the actions. Some were consistent with the procedures of due process, "I, too, struggle with holding the entire firm accountable, he served the firm for twenty years," he was appointed in 1980, but his leadership and designated by the firm to interview. The firm benefited from his mitigation of behavior as to their image and prosperity prior to this, he said to Goretick, of EJF and JLSA.

Other points discussed were the ban to send a clear message to all firms, the "purpose is to send the message that discrimination will not be tolerated. The fact is that even under a ban, students should still be able to interview but do not on their own initiative rather than under the auspices of the Law Center's program and without the use of its services and facilities," argued Paul Hirase of the APALSA.

Concern was the need to consistently enforce policies pertaining to both students and law firms. The Career Services Office has a "no-show" policy which informs future employers about students who don't attend scheduled interviews. The ban was explained as a way to inform students about those firms who do not comply with the Law Center's non-discrimination policies outlined in the literature sent to interviewing firms.

By the end of the meeting the student groups were satisfied. The final vote to ban was 5 to 2. Although it was unclear whether the firm would respond to Areen's letter, the committee should be looking at long-term solutions to discriminatory hiring practices, not just in regards to race, but also to gender and sexual orientation.
On The Left: On The Right:
Reagan Legacy Legal Destruction

By JOHN M. WILLIAMS

Welcome to Georgetown University Law Center in beautiful Washington, D.C. Step outside our newly renovated law school and observe the rampant drug use and sales all around you. In fact, it appears you may have to go no further than the library bathroom. (See Law Weekly, 9-4-89). Listen to conversations and you can hear how bad the drug problem has become, with the blame likely falling on the perceived inadequate measures taken by Ronald Reagan and George Bush. However, we can rest assured that the problem will soon be behind us, as a growing number of liberals have identified a solution: legalization of illicit drugs. (I recognize that not all members of the left have exited this planet to join the legalization lunatics, yet legalization advocates are predominantly liberal.)

Supporters of legalization have many simplistic arguments, but two themes appear most often. First, they argue that the current programs are not working and legislation passed to control drugs has failed to reduce demand. Second, murder and violent crime, which are a direct result of illegal drug trafficking and distribution, would be eliminated through the implementation of a "legal" distribution system. To date, no empirical data has been offered to support either of these contentions. At the same time, legitimate arguments against the legalization of drugs have considerable empirical, historical, pharmacological, and clinical support.

The argument by advocates that legalization is necessary because current programs have failed to produce results is, not only weak, but blatantly incorrect. While no one suggests that America's overwhelming drug problem can be quickly and simply resolved, surrender to the source of the problem is not the answer. Wouldn't it be nice to make all of the dirty drug problem disappear? Unfortunately, like many liberal solutions of the sixties, legalization has no basis in reality. The advocates of legalization themselves have yet to submit a specific proposal outlining the implementation of such a reform. Any attempt to legalize drugs would require addressing many issues, including: which drugs should be legalized? Who will handle distribution? Will there be limits? Who can buy drugs? These are but a few of the many questions which must be answered.

The real counter-argument is that education programs used during the Reagan and Bush Administrations are starting to work. The deep-rooted culture of drug use will require many years to reverse. Yet, in a comprehensive study published this year in American Behavioral Scientist by scientists James Ingarfield and Duane McBride, it was found that drug use behavior in the general population was undeniably decreasing, particularly since 1986.

The second argument, concerning drug-related violence, has focused the recent interest on legalization of drugs. The theory is that much of the current bloodshed is due to " turf battles" and other incidents of the drug trade. Thus, legalization would eliminate the profit incentive and essentially destroy the drug trade. What advocates have failed to realize is that there are different types of violence associated with drugs. "Systemic violence" is the familiar form which results from the drug trade. In addition, there is "psychopharmacological violence" resulting from irrational behavior while using drugs and "economically-compulsive violence" which occurs to support drug use. Several recent reports have indicated that drug use would certainly increase with legalization and in all likelihood any decrease in systematic violence would be accompanied by corresponding increases in psychopharmacological violence and economically-compulsive violence. The net result of legalization would be no reduction in drug use and effectively no new addicts created by the government.

While considering these issues, I decided to consult a knowledgeable friend and local activist, Patricia Godfrey, who received broad acclaim when she spoke at an international conference on drug legalization. While Mr. Godfrey's suggestions are interesting, they vary dramatically in the extent which drugs have upon the family and society. Ms. Godfrey, a former addict of heroin, cocaine, and other drugs, saw drug-related violence take the life of her 18-year-old son this year. But you won't find Patricia Godfrey joining the bandwagon to legalize drugs. She believes the legalization lunatics for what are, people who want to turn their heads and ignore the real problems causing drug abuse. As she says, "legalization will only compound the problem, not resolve it."

Patricia explains that any change is going to take time and that the problem will only be resolved through support, education and a united community effort. Those who support legalization and hope for a "quick fix" to make the problem go away with the least amount of effort. Unfortunately, reversing the tide of drug abuse will be a tedious and lengthy task requiring extensive work. Programs initiated during the Reagan Administration and earlier are beginning to produce results. Legalization would signal a society that condones drug use and effectively pull the rug out from under America's youth who are turning away from drugs in greater numbers.

People who have overcome their own addictions, and fight on a daily basis to keep users from combat the scourge of addiction, recognize the nightmare that legalization would cause. Perhaps those who want to ignore the real problem can draw strength from people like Patricia Godfrey who won't lay down and allow drugs to become a "legal" force of destruction.
SBA Approves Club Budget, Appointments

By LYNNETT WAGNER

The SBA-approved club funds and some Student-Faculty Committee representatives at their September 13th meeting. Delegates and club representatives engaged in substantive discussion about the committee's recommendations.

Over 100 students applied for Student-Faculty Committee this year. The SBA's publicity drive generated a pool of applicants that included over 400 available slots for three positions. Several committees were appointed by the SBA, with the remainder to be approved at the next meeting. A full listing of Student representatives will be published at that time.

GULC clubs were appropriated a total of $54,000. Club appropriations were discussed extensively, and the Committee addressed potential allocations to delegates and club representatives. Specific funding levels are listed on the right. SBA allocations were approved for the Speakers Series, Peer Advising, and the Student Senate.

The SBA distributed a maximum level of available funds to clubs, based on the total SBA allocation of $80,714. The SBA decisions were based on the following criteria: a) benefit to the Association (all GULC students); b) ability of the Association membership to participate; c) alternate sources of funding; and d) the reasonable needs of the group requesting funds; e) restrictions placed on the use of Association Funds by the University or the Law Center; and f) other appropriate considerations.

The Code Critical Project will be launched next week, and the Board of Directors will encourage all students to "Just Say Yes" to helping the homeless. The project will receive homeless people to page 3 and 4 of the Student News. Shuttle service between Union Station and the GULC, another SBA-promoted project, will also be soon launched. This project will increase the comfort and safety of students, but student volunteer drivers are needed.

The Peer Advising Network, which operates in the fashion of Big Brother/Big Sister programs, is to provide to acclimate first year students to the law school environment. Participants can make a positive difference in this Association-wide effort. Watch your folders for more information.

The next SBA meeting will be Tuesday, September 28th at 8:00 p.m. All students are invited to attend.

---

An Irish View of 1992

By DAN CONNORS

The unification of the European Community in 1992 will be a rising tide but not for all boats. That, in a nutshell, was one of the messages University of Galway law graduate and future Irish Barrister, Maureen McNaught, relayed in an intimate and often witty presentation to a packed hall of GULC students on Friday, September 18th.

Ms. McNaught focused her comments on the structure of the legal system in Ireland and the effects of the unification of Europe in 1992. She felt that U.S. lawyers interested in working in the international field should become familiar with the legal systems in Ireland and other European countries because of the increased contact they will have with these countries.

Ms. McNaught emphasized that this is a time of change for Ireland and Europe. The European Union is based on the English common law system. A law school graduate becomes either a Solicitor or Barrister. Barristers are litigators and require two additional years of training. A Solicitor's career path is limited because they cannot litigate and only Barristers can become judges on the High Court and Supreme Court in Ireland. As a member of the European Economic Community, Ireland has managed the transition to the European Union and its legal system. This is a positive fact.

Ms. McNaught emphasized that this will not be accomplished by the plan for 1992. She feels that the benefits of a unified Europe will be primarily economic in nature. This will benefit the industrialized countries (i.e., Britain, France, and Germany) and not the other European countries whose economies are more dependent on agriculture and tourism. Because economic unification will eliminate the revenue of non-industrialized countries receive from tariffs and other sources, loss of revenue will occur at a time when social maladies in the non-industrialized countries are growing worse. Moreover, market competition, the example of Ireland's unemployment: the rate is 16 percent and the country has more college graduates than it can employ. Although loss of revenue will be a problem for non-industrialized countries, the employment and tax benefits of increased investment in these countries might offset such losses.

Ms. McNaught concluded that the opportunities for American law graduates to work in Europe or in the international legal field will expand due to the positive economic climate that will result from the unification of Europe in 1992.
Workshop Offers Alternatives to 3D Years: Law and Economics

Considering that by the third year of law school even the most interesting lecture classes can become rather monotonous, nine third-year students are fortunate to be participants in a stimulating alternative to the usual law school class. These students are the Olin Law and Economics Fellows, members of a year-long program jointly administered by Professors Salop and Schwartz. Fellows include Jennifer Blackman, Diane Copes. Lee Anne Fritzler, Andrew Kolesar, Nancy Lord, Robert Mueller, Paul Ne, Erin O’Hara, and Ed Becker.

The focus of the fellowship is the role of economic analysis in legal decision making. Although the law and economics school has its vocal critics, few lawyers and law students deny the influence of economic analysis on such scholars as Judge Richard Posner in a wide range of legal challenges. The crux of the law and economics movement is that laws and judicial decisions should be analyzed and formulated to take account of all possible consequences, balancing the alternatives to result in socially optimal outcomes. Law and economics theories also seek to expand the plain behavior of actors in the legal process. “Law and economics is not a conservative or liberal thing,” One program member recently explained. “Rather, it’s a mode of analysis—a way to analyze policy choices. It is not law or economics scholars call for the decriminalization of drugs. That’s hard case, considering the distinct part of the law and economics workshop is the presentation by law and economics scholars of papers pending publication. One such presentation will be by Harvard Professor Steve Shavell, whose theories of tort law are well known to every student who has recently had Professor Schwartz’s first-year torts class. Another such presentation concerning the tort liability for oil spills will be given by Victor Goldberg of Columbia Law School.

In the course of the year, each Fellow will present research and write a paper concerning a law and economics topic. Proposed topics include the exclusionary rule; sex, murder, women’s rights, waste disposal, and statute of limitations schemes. Professors Salop and Schwartz hope that many of the student papers will be published. Olin Fellows are also learning about economic incentives in a personal way. Each student is receiving a $6,000 stipend from the Olin Foundation for participating in the fellowship program.

Moot Court Picks Team Members

By TOM BEGLEY

At roughly 2:00 AM, this past Friday, weeks filled with briefs and multiple rounds of oral arguments finally culminated in the selection of the members of this year’s moot court teams. Included in a list of congratulations phone calls by Executive Director, Walter Pryor, were National Team members Christopher S. Floyd, Emily G. Fowden, and Robert S. Kaye. Joe Anderson will be the Coach and the Law Weekly’s own Kevin Holley will be the Assistant Coach.

Pryor remarked that this year’s competition was extremely tough to judge due to the above-average number of participants and an increased level of quality. Pryor stated, “The people were remarkably good. It was difficult in every round for the people judging to determine who was going to win.” He believes the Legal Research and Writing program may be helping to increase the quality of the best and oral arguments.

Pryor stated that the various teams will be traveling to New York City, Philadelphia, Atlantic City, Detroit, and Chapel Hill (North Carolina) among other sites. Pryor believes the teams will perform well. “Having good people helps keep our program going strong and keeps all of the teams in top contender positions.”

The selection process was very grueling for the directors as well as the participants. For the past month the directors have worked every day on the competition, and for the past week have rarely left the Law Center before 2:00 AM. Pryor wishes to thank his staff for their efforts, especially Deanne B. Ancker, David J. Cibrian, and most importantly, Andrew G. Konstantaras who he praises as being “primarily responsible for the effective running of the fall qualifier. He was the reason it ran as smoothly as it did.”

DIRECTORS
Walter Pryor, Executive Director Deanne B. Ancker, Director David J. Cibrian, Director Andrew G. Konstantaras, Director Alex Fernandez, Asst. Director David Lietz, Asst. Director

NATIONAL MOOT COURT THE TEAM: Joe Anderson, Coach Kevin Holley, Asst. Coach Christopher S. Floyd, Emily G. Fowden Robert S. Kaye

CARDIZO ENTERTAINMENT LAW TEAM Christopher Floyd, Coach Martin Waters, Asst’s coach William J. Daily, III Robert Rosen Steven Sledzik

CRAVEN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW TEAM Beth White, Coach James C. Adams, II, Asst’s Coach

Anthony Natter, one of advisors to program

Forthcoming Supreme Court Term: GUNC Profi Brief Media

BY TIM MAGUIRE

Abortion will remain the center of public attention in the forthcoming Supreme Court term, according to a number of Georgetown Law Center faculty members. The faculty members briefed approximately thirty reporters on the Supreme Court in last Wednesday morning at the Law Center. Among the media outlets represented were The Washington Post, National Law Journal, and CBS News.

The faculty members who conducted the briefing included Charles Abernathy, Anette Allen, Susan Feiner, William Greenough, and Paul Rothstein. The moderator of the panel was Thomas Krattenmaker. A videotape of the briefing was given to cable station CNN for possible broadcast at a later date.

Issues the Court will examine this term include the power of federal courts to regulate sexually-oriented businesses (PEPWS, Inc. v. Dallas); the right of immediate family members to terminate extraordinary measures which maintain a comatose patient’s life (Cruzan v. Director, Missouri Department of Health); mandatory student prayer meetings at public schools outside school hours and extracurricular settings (Mergans); and warrantless searches authoritatively for bidden. The recently-developed cause of action is presently being litigated in other suits in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere.

Sparrow will be a plaintiff in the settlement of the Washington organizations combating housing discrimination. Sparrow recently testified to the Law Weekly the rarity of and limitations to his participation in the suit; as a plaintiff, and not an attorney, he was not involved in preparing the case. He said that he is not now nor has he recently been involved in similar suits, noting, “I went to law school and taught.”

Prior to joining Georgetown’s staff in 1979, Sparrow was a staff attorney for the Public Citizen Litigation Group and argued cases on issues ranging from the disclosure of government records under the Freedom of Information Act to prohibition of advertising to physicians on the use of salaried government staffs as full-time political campaigners. At Georgetown, Sparrow has established himself as a intellectually-renowned expert on contract law. He has also written on first amendment rights and the legislative veto.

From left to right, GUNC panelists William Greenough, Ralph Dinan, and Allen. Searches conducted by joint U.S. Mexico teams outside the United States and the admissibility of evidence gained therein (U.S. v. Verdugo-Urquidez). Civil rights cases for the most part absent from the court’s schedule. But the extent of federal courts’ power to remedy discrimination will be considered in Missouri v. Jenkins and Chane v. U.S. In Chane, the constitutionality of contempt citations on city council members of Yakama, New York for refusing to vote for agreed-upon legislation will be decided. Jenkins will validate or invalidate taxes ordered by a federal court to effect school reforms.

Ordering legislators to vote a certain way and levying taxes may seem like extraordinary judicial powers. But Professor S.J., Thomas Krattenmaker, Sue Buch

Abernathy noted that courts have consistently been given wide latitude to effect remedies necessary to enforce anti-discrimination decrees in recent decades. The most discussed issue during the hour and half briefing was that of abortion. In Hodgkins v. Minnesota and Ohio, the Court will rule on Minnesota and Ohio statutes, two of the country’s leading anti-abortion laws. Pryor believes the teams will perform well. "Having good people helps keep our program going strong and keeps all of the teams in top contender positions.”

The selection process was very grueling for the directors for the first month the directors have worked every day on the competition, and for the past week have rarely left the Law Center before 2:00 AM. Pryor wishes to thank his staff for their efforts, especially Deanne B. Ancker, David J. Cibrian, and most importantly, Andrew G. Konstantaras who he praises as being "primarily responsible for the effective running of the fall qualifier. He was the reason it ran as smoothly as it did.”

DIRECTORS
Walter Pryor, Executive Director Deanne B. Ancker, Director David J. Cibrian, Director Andrew G. Konstantaras, Director Alex Fernandez, Asst. Director David Lietz, Asst. Director

NATIONAL MOOT COURT THE TEAM: Joe Anderson, Coach Kevin Holley, Asst. Coach Christopher S. Floyd, Emily G. Fowden Robert S. Kaye

CARDIZO ENTERTAINMENT LAW TEAM Christopher Floyd, Coach Martin Waters, Asst’s coach William J. Daily, III Robert Rosen Steven Sledzik

CRAVEN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW TEAM Beth White, Coach James C. Adams, II, Asst’s Coach

William J. Daily, William H. Devaney, David Domene Eddie Torres

Warren Schwartz, one of advisors to program
First Year Hell: The Socratic Method

Adapted with permission from a pamphlet by Dr. Roy W. Matthews III (M.S., M.Ed., Ph.D., J.D.)

The Socratic Method has had a place in legal education for the past century now, but does it really work? Several psychiatrists and professors have taken a look at the emotional effect and intellectual credibility of the Socratic Method. As students may not realize, the Socratic Method was introduced by Dean Langdell at Harvard University after the Civil War. According to Langdell, the principles were: (1) law is a science; (2) Case study is the only method of "scientific" study; (3) "Critical dialogue" is the best way to help a student learn "science"; (4) Principles of legal doctrines are clearly discernible; (5) Principles are not to be laid out before a student. Much could be said by way of criticizing these dramatic assumptions. In fact, they apparently were not even well accepted at Harvard even a century ago. Students regarded the "Socratic" Method as "chaotic" and attendance at Langdell's classes dwindled to a "handful." Perhaps the Socratic Method became more popular because of the attitudes of educators like Professor Fuller who asserted in a Stanford Law Review article that the law professor's job is to "set the students mind free... releasing [it] from routines of thought and habits of pre-judgement that had kept [the student] from really thinking." It is supposed to be a variety of the cozy and flavorful activity called, "some, let us reason it out together." Professor Rutter in the Cincinnati Law Review, but he believes that the "self-solving idea of the law school Socratic Method is (a) virtually unattainable.

Besides falling in its essential purpose of providing an intellectual basis in the law, the Socratic Method inflicts a high degree of emotional trauma in the meantime. Harvard Law Professor Duncan Kennedy has said that legal educators are a group of sadists destroying the mental health of students, observing that the atmosphere in the law school classroom is as heavy with fear as it is tense with intellectual conflict. A psychiatrist described the Socratic Method as "infantilizing, dehumanizing, sadistic, a device that promotes hostility and competition among students: it is self-serving and destructive of positive values." Indeed, this stress and anxiety have driven some students into a deep sense of failure and despair, creating an unaffect quality of professional interplay. And even the professors are complaining. Professor Llewellyn (father of the Uniform Commercial Code) stated in 1947 that "half of the ordinary first-year class comes into the second semester unable to read cases, unable to think cases, unable to build with cases, and unable to argue with cases accurately..." The interesting thing about the criticism is that it seems as if somehow the students fail that they do not know how to grapple with the complexity of the reasoning of the professors. The professors are right about something and that is the many students are not getting the material (and not liking it either). A recent poll indicated that a majority of California feel that they were "short-changed" by their legal education; there was a failure to impart basic legal information and to prepare the student for the practical problem-solving of the daily routine of general practice. Many human beings simply do not function effectively with the law school pressure-cooker atmosphere, and through the latter part of the first year and into the second year, the student becomes less and less willing to expose themselves and only the hearty few will enter the dialogue with any pleasure or enthusiasm.

It is interesting to compare the legal education of American students to their English law school counterparts. English law professors use both "text books" (as opposed to "case books"), utilize a case-by-case discussion format (as opposed to the "Socratic dialogue") and stress the "book learning" method.

Whether the English alternative to the Socratic Method should be followed is uncertain but what is clear is this: the Socratic dialogue should be dispensed with, at least as it is currently used. (Dr. Matthews will be presenting his seminar on "How to Survive Law School" in the Washington-Baltimore area again on November 30.)

HOW TO SURVIVE LAW SCHOOL

1. Noted from an article in the Legal Times, October 21, 1986.

By JOSEPH W. RAND

I figured it would go like this. I'd walk in the first day for Con-
tracts, and the professor, a stern gray-bearded man in a
gray suit with suspenders and a bow tie, would give us the first as-
ignment.

"Read pages 1-729 of the text and write a 45-page paper on the
development of the theories of damages for contract breach from the
Stone Age forward."

"For Monday."

Then I would numbly go to the rest of my classes, all of them
similarly directed by other stern gray-bearded men, and get
my other assignments.

For Constitutional Law: Brief
All Supreme Court cases. Ever.

For Property: Read pages 1-
1,038 and all related materials.

For Criminal Law: Free
James Brown.

And I went to class and surveyed
my fellow classmates, I would find a hickoid group of malcontent grade-hackers with knives stuffed into their belts all ready to be inserted into the nearest back.

All right, so maybe I ex-
aggerate a hair, but only to illustrate the trepidation that all of us "1Ls" probably felt at coming to law school. We were all told that law school was DIFFER-
ENT, that it was far and away more difficult than anything we had ever done before. Of course, the people telling us this were themselves law school students who were probably just trying to lessen the lawyer guilt and improve their chances of getting a job.

They had me scared, though. They said it would be a great student, and I'm not. In fact, not for that $5,000 cash and anxiety have driven some
in my admissions interview, I'd probably be at Bob's Law School instead right now instead of Georgetown.

So, what happens? I take a look at my first assignments and we're talking maybe 15
pages a class, 25 pages tops. Not that bad. I expect that the
readings are going to be as de-
verse and dry as an LSAT Reading Comp passage, and find that, well, okay, they ARE as dense and dry as an LSAT Reading Comp passage, but at least they're only 15-20 pages long.

Of course, I do not mean to insinuate to any of you that the work isn't difficult. It is. I just expected it to be insurmount-
able, which it is not. I mention this qualification especially for all of the 1L professors who are now eyeing their sylabi with the intention of doubling the workload because of one smar-
tass student with too much free time.

The only difference between law school and college so far is that law school requires that you do your work, all your work, and that you do it on time. In college, you could wait until the
to the bookstore after the crowds had disappeared, say aroundHallo-

In college, you could wait until the

bookstore after the crowds had disappeared, say around Hallo-

ers, and pick up your books without doing irreparable dam-
age to your GPA. I think that if you tried this in law school

and you'd very quickly find yourself in some other line of study, like

getting a Masters in floor-
swearing at the University of Roy Rogers.

The best surprise of all, however, was the character of the people in the class. I ex-
pected a bunch of backstab-
ning, competitive geeks who would make my life miserable, and well, I found them. But I also found a whole lot of peo-
ple, the vast majority, who aren't really any different from the
people with whom I went to college. Of course, since I went to
Georgetown Undergrad, many of them ARE the same people with whom I went to college. It seems like half my sen-
ior class came here (although admissions says it's 70-80).

In any case, it seems like there is the same mix of people you'll find anywhere: some brains, some jocks, some beautiful people, some heavy drinkers, even some airheads who I thought would be flight attendants by now. Okay, may-
be everyone is just a little heav-
er than in college, and a little balder, but the personalities are the
same. And we all share a common bond: none of us want to spend the next three years in the Real World.

So, at least we got rid of all those Med School types; they're all playing around now with dead
bodies. Good Riddance to them next time we will see them in

malpractice court.

So it seems that all of my worrying was for naught. The
work is demanding, but not overwhelming, and everyone is

LOTFER LAW BOOK CO., INC.
111 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
(Entrance - Second & H St., N.W.)
842-4334
We are across the street from the
Georgetown Law Center Library

Compare Our Prices
Before You Buy Elsewhere.

LOWEST PRICES IN THE COUNTRY
BETTER SERVICE
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Bookstore Controversy: Manager Arguments

In last Monday's Law Weekly, Assistant Dean Conry was quoted as saying the Georgetown Bookstore "doesn't sell over list..." The following is a list of raised prices taken from last year's Georgetown book list. On the left is the national list price, on the right is Georgetown's.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Title</th>
<th>List Price</th>
<th>Georgetown Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deb 100: Test Prep</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Chemistry</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microeconomics</td>
<td>$22.95</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete Mathematics</td>
<td>$39.95</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus 2</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculus II &amp; III</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry 1</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics II</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>$79.95</td>
<td>$89.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You have been told to believe that the bookstore is "paying for itself," and it is not being assisted by the rest of the corporation that is Georgetown or by your tuition dollars. Yet the newly constructed bookstore has sold less than 30% of its paper stock since its inception. (We know this because Lerner's has done over 70% of the Georgetown market.) No private enterprise could survive on such a poor market share unassisted.

Finally you are being told that Lerner's was a "monopoly" that it was because University Press is not making a profit. There is no doubt like AT&T, and that the Georgetown Bookstore was not as expensive as Lerner's, and that it is a "monopoly." Aside from the fact that Georgetown University is a fully subsidized tax-exempt organization, with some of the largest property holdings in the city, we have learned that last year Georgetown University grossed approximately $15 million in sales receipts through its many "services." Their various entities include a bid to the board to buy the bookstore at George Washington University. Lerner's can hardly boast such power. The cost of construction for the new bookstore alone must have exceeded $100,000, an amount that would take decades for Lerner's to amass, if ever. The idea of a multi-million dollar corporation "competing" with a small business is ludicrous.

It is fairly said to say that the students' tuition dollars are financing the for-profit bookstore ventures of Georgetown University, i.e., the Bookstore. Not only does the individual student pay more for books at the Georgetown Bookstore than at Lerner's, but his tuition dollars pay for the construction and overhead costs of the Georgetown Bookstore.

In the case of Lerner's vs. Georgetown, "competition" is a specious label that is being used to hide important realities.

1. The market for student law books at Georgetown University will not support and sustain two law bookstores.
2. Georgetown University cannot be said to be "fair competition.
3. The student is paying for the hidden costs of a subsid- ized bookstore that already charges above the necessary price.

It may sound cynical, but in real life, David usually gets crushed by Goliath.

Brad Van Grack
Lerner Law Book Co.

Continued from p. 1

both Lerner's and GULC are selling at a lower price, certainly no detriment to the students. In addition to contesting prices, Lerner's contends that GULC can only be surviving on a subsidy. Coneway projects that at 30% of the business, and by operating at similar costs that Lerner's does, the campus store must have a loss of approximately $166,250 last year and should have gone out of business.

Duvall states that these figures are "totally incorrect." First, law students do not spend only $350 per year on law books and materials. By using such a figure, Lerner's has overvalued their share of the business and undervalued ours.

Thompson confirmed this stating the law students spend approximately $450 per year. In addition, by offering more services such as GULC's memorabilia and one-day photo service which yield a higher profit than textbook sales.

Continued from p. 5

Larsen, an Adjunct Professor of Law at GULC, and in practice at the Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, was the keynote speaker. With a keynote address by Craig Covault, Aviation Week and Space Technology magazine's space editor, and an inspring luncheon talk by ex-NASA Administrator James C. Fletcher, the symposium was to be both stimulating and motivational to all participants. The professional and student presentations, when published should provide a definitive baseline for professional and commercial interests in the law and policy of outer space in the near future.

Inside Washington

By RICH NILSEN

A declassified report from the United States Department of Defense, recently obtained by Inside Washington, reveals startling new information on the US's inventory of biological weaponry. The report states that American advances in genetic engineering have led to a breakthrough in the use of genetically engineered weapons, such as cloned vari- eties of snake venom, malaria, and the very rare Rift Valley Fever. Also being studied are entirely new lab-built viruses and bacteria.

According to the report, the main purpose of this experiment has been for use in military operations. For example, scientists can now create bacteria designed to attack specific human organs, such as the eyes of enemy soldiers. Also being researched for military deployment are viruses whichcan degrade enemy troops during fighting in nuclear environments.

The report also states that no defensive field equipment currently in use can adequately protect against these new biological weapons. Moreover there are no known antidotes for the majority of these lab-created diseases.

To date, the US policy on the production of gene-based weaponry has been to maintain parity with the Soviet Union, which continues to maintain the largest biological weapons stockpile in the world. Other analysts have also been concerned about Soviet battle plans that continue to emphasize the offensive use of biological weaponry in armed conflict.

Notwithstanding, the Bush White House is actively seeking an agreement to limit or ban the production and deployment of these weapons. Insiders say the President may not reach an agreement, calling for a new international conference to discuss the issue and move towards a multilateral solution.

CAPITAL CURRENTS—selling cracked drug informers, the cartels in Columbia and Bolivia are now considering new methods of smuggling drugs into the United States. The cartels are reportedly looking into the idea of buying diesel submarines and purchasing land on both sides of the border with an eye to tunneling and piping in drugs.

*****Marxist South Yemen has warned that the new diplomatic ties after a 20-year break, South Yemen, one of the world's most isolated nations, hopes to end its isolation from the west and obtain help for its suffering nation. NEXT WEEK: A major earth- quake in Israel. Bye, Bye
A Law of Leisure

Love the Law

LOVE THE LAW

LAW WORDS

tort
delinquent
instant case
void
scared
sentenced
in rem
bailing
brief

Kettle of Bedlam

BY JOE ATKINS

This week y’all get a bit of a respite from my ravings about noise and distortion and fuzz guitar and the rest. I don’t know whether there will be any jokes in the column this week. I never really do until it’s written anyway. So if cheap yuks is all you’re looking for when you read this, I can only hope along with you that I think of something marginally witty to stick in somewhere.

In order to help keep everyone abreast of the latest yuppies trends and the hip advertisements they spawn, I thought you should at least have some hip and trendy tunes to play. New Orleans seems to be experiencing something of a renaissance. Cajun food is definitely cool — crawdads, blackened fish, red beans and rice, jambalaya, and Dixie Beer (the next Rolling Rock? Unless of course you believe the Old Milwaukee ads). Lee Jeans is running an ad which is like a video for rubbed pie set in a roadside diner with a syntocod soundtrack. How jeans are implicated in the whole scheme baffles me. Of course Rain Man, which features a truly abominable version of “Iko Iko” by the Belle Stars.

You dig folk, blues, country, traditional British/Celtic music like Richard Thompson, the Pogues, Van Morrison and the Chieftains, or even just good ol’ Little Feat, you should definitely groove on the sounds of the Bayou. Since it’s totally unnecessary to buy records anymore (aside from becoming more difficult even to find. Sigh), I’ll start with some things you can get on CD.

The soundtrack to The Big Easy is a good starting place for aspiring dilettantes. It’s got most of the names you need to sound well-versed: Buckwheat Zydeco, Professor Longhair, Beausoleil, Neville Brothers, Wild Tchoupitoulas (pronounced “choop-‘tou-louz”: extra points for knowing this), and of course the Dixie Cups doing the original, pure, and unadulterated “Iko Iko”. The songs run the gamut of styles: soul, gospel, accordion-fueled zydeco, Cajun, barrelhouse piano, and second-line funk.

There are plenty of great albums available (also on CD) by nearly everyone on the soundtrack. The Neville Brothers have a splendid new CD out called Yellow Moon which you can find in any record store. You can find Buckwheat Zydeco’s two recent albums in most major chains. The other bands may require a bit more digging and perseverance. Tower Records has a good selection as does Olson’s Books and Records.

There are a number of noteworthy records which mix rock with traditional bayou music, like Beausoleil’s Bayou Cadillac (the title cut is a medley of “Not Fade Away”, “Bo Diddley”, and “Iko Iko” sung mostly in French). Mamo’s self-titled debut release, and Wayne Toups and Zydecajun’s Blast From the Bayou. For more traditional Crescent City tunes, look for records by Queen Ida, Clifton Chenier, D.L. Menard, Rockin’ Dopsie, Rockin’ Sidney, and Boozoo Chavis. And you thought accordions were only allowed to be played at dult, cash bar weddings of relatives you vaguely know. Most of this stuff is flat-out partying and dancing music, with a few ballads and slow dance tunes for cozying up to your best girl or guy after some sweaty booby shakin.

And for everyone who is sick of taking the words to the chorus of “Iko, Iko”, here they are: Talking “bout, hey now, hey now, Iko Iko don dey Jacko mo fino an don dey Jacko mo fin ay” I don’t know what they mean either, but they are great to sing along with.
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America's Only Theatre
With Its Own Law School

By ALEX FERNANDEZ

The Georgetown Gilbert and Sullivan Society (GGS&SS) is about to begin its 17th season in the footlights. The company, founded in 1972 by some enterprising students who wanted more out of a moot court room than a place to practice their oral arguments, has taken on a life of its own. The works of Gilbert and Sullivan (a gout-plagued composer) gave them the chance to have fun and make fun of the law at the same time. They even managed to get a few of their professors into the action. Soon, the group expanded their repertoire to include occasional one-act plays and Broadway shows. The Society, which bills itself as "America's Only Theater Company with its Own Law School," follows a basic philosophy that "theater is important." Since its founding, the society has expanded, performing a Broadway production in the Fall and a GGS&SS work in the Spring.

This Fall's production will be Bye Bye Birdie that will be followed in the Spring by H.M.S. Pinafore.

By LANCE POTTER

Have you ever noticed that the TOMBS, the vaults, the sarcophagus (sarcophagi) or whatever caught the eye at the Washington Monument? Did you ever think about what lay beneath that great stone block? Did you ever wonder if there was something more? Did you ever realize that these tombs are not just a collection of stones but a collection of stories? Did you ever think about who might have been buried there? Did you ever wonder what they might have been like?

The vaults you might find someone famous or rich buried in.

At Arlington Cemetery there is one sort of like these four monoliths. It's got soldiers walking back and forth in front of all day long. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is quite the tourist attraction. Our tombs aren't really much of a tourist attraction yet, though lots of the locals see them and I'm sure word will spread. Our tombs are diligently guarded by Georgetown Security Guards. They lock the flaps and padlock the soldiers but as far as I can see no one has damaged our tombs yet.

Who's buried in them anyway? Should they be called "The Tombs of the Unknown Students?" Is there one for a student from each year plus one for a combination of all students? Are those interned within unknown victims of the law school process? Martyrs for the cause? Sacrifices to the scales of justice?

Maybe the vaults are where they secretly store away unruly students who insist on talking in class after first semester of first year. Or more likely, it's where they bury those who complain about the spiraling cost of school while being forced to endure the continued inconvenience of construction. Uh-oh, I may be next. Or maybe... hush... it's where the namesakes of our two buildings are buried, Bernard McDonough and the great Edward Bennett Williams. If that's the case, let us know so we can pay our due respects. That would still leave the question of who is in, or will be in the other two tombs: a former dean? the last liberal Supreme Court Justice? Maybe, just maybe, no one is buried in there at all. But how could that be? They certainly wouldn't spend millions of dollars to build something that ugly because they thought it looked nice. Would they? Who knows? Anyway, I was just wondering.
For over a decade the vast majority of students in DC, MD, VA & PA have chosen BAR/BRI... 

“Fantastic help. I was very pleased. All were knowledgeable, approachable, and helpful. I will recommend BAR/BRI to others!”

GEORGE WASHINGTON 7/89

“Levine’s predictions for the essay were right on target!!”

GEORGETOWN 7/89

“Excellent. The scope and quality of services are impressive.”

GEORGE MASON 7/89

“I am totally satisfied with my level of preparation for the bar—thank you!”

AMERICAN 7/89

“Very good. All the good things I was told about it by lawyers I know were true.”

DUQUESNE 7/89

“BAR/BRI did a good job in preparing everyone. I thought that more studying would have been useless and perhaps harmful. I was afraid that since other courses worked their students for very long hours that we’d be disadvantaged—but that’s not true.”

U MICHIGAN 7/89

continued from page 1

representatives of the student groups offering to help in easing the situation and voicing their appreciation of the Office of Career Services. Gorelick suggested programming the lottery computer so that those students who lost their Baker & McKenzie slots would get their first choice in a later lottery. Dean Thormer said that while there is no way to do that by computer, she would consider the suggestion and have staff figure out a way to implement such a plan manually.

In the future the committee will decide whether and how much data on interviewing and hiring can be collected and if Georgetown should conduct its own interviewer training. In addition, Professor Jordan suggested, Georgetown should require firms to sign a non-discrimination pledge before inviting them to come on campus and should establish separate investigative procedures and sanctions for complaints arising at Georgetown and those occurring at other campuses.

Continued from p. 6
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tals (Turner v. Ragsdale). Such a limitation would often increase both the cost of, and travelling time for, obtaining abortions thereby making access to the procedure more difficult for poor women. Professor Allen, who initially presented these cases to the audience, said that the decisions will once again place Justice Sandra Day O’Connor prominently in the public eye. O’Connor, in the widely-noted Webster decision, upheld restrictions on abortion which she did not see as violative of women’s rights. Her opinion suggested that she is guided by “personal morality” and “policy considerations” she would lessen her predictability in the coming cases. But Professor Abner thyly predicts she would vote to uphold the procedures.

Professor Rothstein warned that a Ragsdale limitation of abortions to fully-equipped hospitals combined with Webster’s permitted withholding of government monies for abortions could constitute a powerful restriction on the procedure, because government funding is almost always needed to construct fully-equipped public hospitals.

Only fleetingly discussed by the panel was Baltimore City Department of Social Services v. Bouknight, the case in which second year students wrote in the journal write-on competition last spring. This case concerns a mother’s refusal to produce her child before a court on the ground that by producing the child (possibly injured or dead through abuse) she would be incriminating herself. Professor Greenhalgh contrasted this case with that of Elizabeth Morgan, presently jailed in the District of Columbia for refusing to produce her daughter, because Morgan is asserting a moral, rather than any constitutional, right (fear for the child’s safety in the custody of her estranged husband).

The Bouknight case places societal interest in conflict with constitutional rights. When, as in Bouknight, societal interest is placed in opposition to constitutional rights, Greenhalgh suggested that the constitution should be favored. But, interestingly, the panel admitted that it would be impossible to provide immunity in the Bouknight case because of state statutes limiting immunity to criminal investigations, thereby absolutely preventing the court from compelling the child’s production.

The Law Weekly will further examine the Bouknight case as the date of oral arguments for the case (November 7) approaches. The Weekly will also be publishing calendars of upcoming Supreme Court oral arguments throughout the fall term.
Registrar

EXAM CONFLICTS: Students who wish to petition for relief from an exam conflict may do so at the Office of the Registrar. The deadline for submission of exam conflict forms is September 15, 1989.

GRADUATION AUDITS for prospective February 1990 graduates have been mailed. If you did not receive yours, please contact the Registrar's Office.

SPRING EXAM REVIEW will be held thru September 28. Forms for requesting exams are available at the Registrar's counter.

TRANSCRIPTS: The interview season is open. Order your transcripts now! 48 Hours notice is appreciated.

REPLACEMENT DATES AND TIME FOR LOST ID CARDS: September 7—3:00-6:00; September 12—3:00-6:00. The cost for a replacement ID is $10.00 and you need a photo of ID.

MAY GRADUATES: Students anticipating graduation must complete an application for degree by October 1, so that a graduation audit may be completed and diplomas ordered. Forms may be mailed to the Office of the Registrar. Late filing of application will result in a $50.00 late fee and the possibility that you will not have a diploma at Commencement.

CURRENT LOCAL ADDRESS: All students are urged to update their biographical information to ensure that the Office of the Registrar has a current local address for future mailings. If you have an office number, please give us that too.

CLASS POSTPONEMENT NOTICE may be approved by calling the recorded postponement number: 662-9464.

STUDENT DISCIPLINARY CODE: A student is held to have notice of the GULC Student Disciplinary Code and its provisions by virtue of enrolling at the Law Center. The Code appears in the Bulletin.

PRIVACY ACT: Under the Privacy Act, the Law Center may release certain information designated as "Directory Information" (see Administrative and Academic Regulations, Aug. 1988). Students may elect to have this "Directory Information" withheld by filing the appropriate form at the Office of the Registrar. The deadline to file is September 20, 1989.

SCHEDULE CONFIRMATIONS have been mailed to your local address of record. If you do not receive yours by Friday, September 8, please check with your Schedule—Baker & McKenzie Ban

Students who were scheduled to interview with Baker & McKenzie, now banded from on-campus interviews this fall, should contact Marilyn Tucker about a replacement interview.

Women in Law as a Second Career Interview Session

A workshop for Women in Law as a Second Career will be held on Tue., Sept. 19, at 3:00 p.m. To RSVP, call 306-1000.

BLSA Mid-East Job Fair Preference sheets and resumes for this program are due into the Office of Career Services by Thurs., Sept. 21.

Alianza Meets With Practicing Attorneys

Attorneys from the Washington, D.C. area, practicing both in the public and private sectors, will be at GULC tonight to meet with Latino students and to share information, advice and support. These attorneys will discuss career plans and job hunting strategies. The program will be held in Room 109 at 7:45 p.m.

What Happens at a Hiring Committee Meeting

The Chair of the hiring committee and the recruitment coordinator from both Chadbourne & Prake (NYC) and Mille & Chevalier will be here to describe hiring committee meetings and to explain what happens at these closed door sessions. The program will be held in Hall 206 at 7:45 p.m. in Tuesday, Sept. 19.

Boston Law Firm Group Reception

A panel presentation and reception for minority law students. Attorneys hope to share their honest views of the situation and of practice opportunities. This program will be held on Mon., Sept. 25 at 7:45 in Room 140 of the Law Center.

Skadden Fellowship

Applications from Skadden Arps Meagher & Flom will be at GULC on Wed., Sept. 20 at 3:00 p.m. LL.Ms in the Job Market

A workshop for LL.M students will be held on Tues., Sept. 19 at 5:00 p.m. in room 109.

On-Campus Interview Program

The On-Campus Interview Program begins today. While the majority of interviews take place across the street at the Washington Court Hotel (formerly The Sheraton), be careful to note that some employers were unable to make reservations there and are interviewing at the Hyatt Regency, Phoenix Park or Quality Inn—as well as in their D.C. offices.

Interviewer names and exact room number for each firm interview will be available at the Georgetown Career Services desk in the lobby of the Washington Court Hotel every day during the entire four week period.

Students must continue to check the Change board throughout the season. Although preference sheets may be turned in, interview locations may change and/or employers may cancel.

Financial Services

Lynn Reihart, Financial Services, and Annette Singletary, Student Life, will present guidance for club appropriations on September 21 at 4:30 in Room 109. All club officers are required to attend and refreshments will be provided.

American Bar Association


Library

Effective immediately, Westlaw and Lexis have lifted the Tuesday through Thursday restricted hours for law students and faculty. The system is updated between 11 p.m. Saturday and 7 a.m. Sunday, but is available at all other times. Thus, there are no longer any hours during which law school subscribes in particular are unable to use either Lexis or Westlaw.

Lexis hours

Effective immediately, Lexis is available around the clock seven days a week. Formerly, law schools could not access Lexis/Nexis at any time that the system is available. Ask the Reference Librarians for details.

Jewish Law Students Association—PARTY!

Food — Drinks — Music. Wednesday, Sept. 20, 3:30-5:30 p.m. Room 110. Shabbat Speaker Series — Fri. 9/22, 7:15 p.m. In the Pub (behind the cafeteria). Featured Speaker: Prof. Lisa Granik (Professor of Soviet Law and Family Law). Join us!!

Law & Business Society Emergency Meeting

All active members or interested parties must attend. Tues., Sept. 19, 5:00 p.m. Check society bulletin board for location.

SUBSCRIBE!

Effective with Vol. 25, #1, Fall 1989, The Law Weekly will be completely restructuring its subscription list. Computerization of our offices will enable us to much more efficiently process subscriptions. Orders & address changes. Subscription price will be $5.00 semestery or $16.00/year.
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Come and take part in the Tuesday Briefing! Student Fellowship hour from 1:00 to 2:00, held in room 141. Everyone is welcome.

The law firm of Latham & Watkins cordially invites students and faculty to meet with members of their firm at an informal reception on Thursday, September 21, 1989 in the Reception Room of the Washington Court Hotel from 4:30 to 6:00 P.M.