Kill clerkship committee, report urges

According to Hutchinson, if the Committee follow-up is to be effective, the applicant's package must be mailed within a week to ten days of the judge's expression of interest. In fact, says Hutchinson, this summer, several students' packages were not mailed for four to six weeks. Two federal circuit judges called Hutchinson this summer, inquiring about the Committee and noting that, although Georgetown students had told them to expect application materials from the Committee, they had received nothing. Several students went to Hutchinson in early August, complaining that the judges they were applying to had never received their files.

"The problem is time," Hutchinson noted. "Federal courts begin picking law clerks at the end of the second semester of the second year. Certain judges value the kind of package the Committee ends up putting together. What we don't hear is from the judges who don't consider a Georgetown grad because the package is not there in time."

"I feel we should do what most schools do, putting the burden on the student to put together the package. Without the Committee, the student loses the postage paid and the dubious benefit of a corporate letter," Hutchinson noted. "But if the return is a guarantee of efficient service, it's worth it. Columbia is the only other school that I know has a system quite similar to ours. Most law schools have faculty members with particular knowledge and expertise on certain courts who are available to the students."

Observing that the Law Center has maintained a very good track record, placing 9-13 percent of its graduates in judicial clerkships in recent years compared to a national average of 6-8 percent, Hutchinson concludes, "We could make a bigger dent in the market if we didn't slow people down and make them non-competitive."

In fact, the Law Center placed only 7.5 percent of the class of '78 in clerkship positions, according to the Clerkship Committee's 1978 report. This puts the Law Center on a par with the average American law school in the judicial clerkship area. Of the 44778 graduates for whom the Clerkship Committee compiled packages, 40 secured judicial clerkships. Eight members of the

Budget process reform slated

In addition to approving the new student members of the student faculty committees and voting to retain two student-faculty committees (see accompanying story), the SBA has taken the first step in reforming its budgeting process for Law Center student activities.

Copies of a new proposal drafted by SBA Treasurer Frank Comito were circulated to SBA delegates, who plan to vote on the proposal at the next SBA meeting on October 5.

The proposal would create a Student Appropriations Committee (SAC) consisting of seven members. One member would be the SBA Treasurer; of the remaining six, half would be selected by the House of Delegates, and half by the SBA President with the consent of the House of Delegates. The SAC would have the authority to approve or disapprove budgets for all of the Law Center's student organizations not involved in publishing. Student organizations would deal directly with the SAC in all budget matters, but would have the right to appeal any decision of the SAC to the full House of Delegates. The House of Delegates would be required to approve all budget decisions of the SAC, but the provision for such a voting procedure in

SBA to keep minority, evening committees

By JOHN LUND

The SBA House of Delegates has voted to request that Dean David J. McCarthy, Jr., reinstate two faculty-student committees abolished at the end of the last academic year and appoint faculty members to the committees.

The Committee on Minorities and the Evening Division Committee both functioned as subcommittees of the Co-Curricular and Student Activities Committee. Luis Nido, Day Vice-President, told the House of Delegates that McCarthy had decided to abolish both committees since he considered them to be superfluous.

The matter came up as the SBA's first meeting of the year last Monday, when the delegates voted to approve the list of students selected by Luis Nido to serve on the various faculty-student committees at the Law Center. Nido told the delegates that he favored retaining both committees,
Two professors receive tenure

The Law Center’s number of tenured faculty has been increased by two. Professors Jeff Baumman and Richard Chused were granted tenure in June, raising the count of tenured faculty to 37 out of an existing 54 permanent full-time positions.

Although both professors are pleased about receiving tenure, Baumann commented that one can never be sure about receiving tenure. Chused, a professor here for four years, received some initial resistance because some tenured faculty believed that he had not published sufficiently. Chused felt that his recent book, A Modern Approach to Property, “definitely made the difference of the tenure decision.”

An instructor is eligible for tenure after three years as a full-time faculty member. Before tenure is granted, the president of the University must approve each case, after receiving recommendations from the Law Center Committee on Faculty Affairs and the University-wide Rank and Tenure Committee.

Law Center Dean David J. McCarthy Jr. said: “An appropriate tenure decision must look at evidence of ego, intellect and scholarship. Publication is evidence of ego. It shows a willingness of the individual to risk criticism from his peers.” Hopefully, the professor who will work in the publication as he continues in his respective teaching areas throughout his teaching career.

Baumann came to Georgetown in 1973 after five years with Arnold & Porter following his graduation from Yale Law School. After graduating from University of Chicago Law School, Chused taught at Rutgers for a few years before arriving at Georgetown in the fall of 1973.

There are currently seven faculty members eligible for tenure: Charles Abrahams, John Coffee, Michael Geiman, Patrick King, Louis Goldman, Peter Tague and Wendy Williams.

Star delivery resumes

By PETER LEVINE

Delivery of The Washington Star will resume in two weeks after a two-week trial at the request of Law Center personnel, said Mike Murphy, a local distributor.

Murphy decided to halt delivery at the Law Center about a month ago, when expenses exceeded revenue. The news rack resulted in losses of $7-$8 a week. At one point, Murphy received payments for only 35 of 100 papers he delivered during that week.

To break even, he would have to be paid for more than 75 papers, Murphy said. “If I broke even or lost just one or two dollars a week, I would have continued to deliver the paper,” said Murphy, who distributes newspapers at 16 locations.

“1 was losing too much money.”

Though thefts have occurred since delivery of the Star began here last October, the losses did not become severe until this summer.


Nader offers research stipends

By ROBERT COOK

Ralph Nader’s Center for Study of Responsive Law is offering student research stipends this fall aimed at providing documentation in public interest areas. The stipends are available in 15 subjects, and are for $300.00 each. The deadline for submitting applications is October 10.

According to Nader’s letter to Law Center Professor Joseph Page, the Center is sponsoring the project this year in order to provide research in areas of “deep concern to citizens” which are inadequately researched, in part because the investigation of these areas would not serve the customary special interests or governmental missions that fund most research in our country.

The topics are not areas normally conducive to traditional library research. The relevant material will come largely from government document rooms, court records, questionnaires, interviews and similar sources.

Seven of the proposed topics are specifically recommended for law student research. These include Corporations in Collusion, Corporate Crime, Corporate Foundations, Corporations and Law Firms, Defense Contractors, Government Loan Guarantees to Business, and Sports and Municipal Finances. None of these topics correspond to seminars now being offered at Georgetown.

Any student interested in tacking one of the topics should see Professor Page for more information and an application.

Nader indicated that the Center was willing to assist the selected students in locating the necessary research materials, and would help publish articles arising from the research.

Moot Court team selected

By JEFFREY L. SMITH

In a surprising close competition for this year’s National Moot Court Team, David Garcia, Shelley Lorenzana, and Ron Moller emerged victorious from a runoff argument heard last Thursday.

The winners were chosen on the basis of a composite brief writing and oral argument score. Due to the closeness of the oral argument scores of six entrants, Professors Steven Goldberg, Richard Gordon, and William Rodgers presided as judges of the special runoff arguments.

The 29th Annual National Moot Court Competition is sponsored by the Bar Association of the City of New York. This year’s problem, encompassing issues of administrative law with constitutional overtones, is based on the Federal Trade Commission’s recent proposal to ban the advertising to children of foods containing excessive sugar levels. The competition was open to all law day and evening students.

Judges for the morning oral arguments were Dean John Kramer and Professor Edith Weiss and Stephen Goldberg. The evening session judges were Professors Louis Goldman and Richard Alan Gardner, and Linda Halperin, ‘79, the team’s coach and a past team member. Professor Goldberg, who coached the briefs, has offered to confer individually with the entrants to critique their briefs.

The 15 participants in the 1978 competition tripled the number from last year. 112 people initially expressed interest in this year’s competition. The increased interest in the Moot Court Team is attributed to innovations by Halperin. For the first time, she was able to arrange academic writing competitions for entrants. In addition, Law & Policy in International Business accepted the briefs in lieu of participation in its own writing competition. The American Criminal Law Review has agreed to participate in next year’s writing competition.

Halperin thinks the most significant benefit of participation is quite simple: “You learn how to argue. Effectively. Plain and simple.”

Georgetown’s Moot Court Team now faces grueling regional and national competition to be held, respectively, in Philadelphia in mid-November and in New York in late January. In the national competition, the brief will count for 40 percent of the score and the oral argument will count for 60 percent. The regional scoring is 25 percent for the brief and 75 percent for the argument.

The Jesup Cup is the next oral advocacy competition open to upperclassmen. Information on rules and this year’s topic have not yet been announced. The Beauty Cup, the oral advocacy competition for first-year students, will be conducted in the spring.
Reporting graduates find jobs available

While increasing numbers of Law Center graduates are failing to report their employment status to the Placement
office, more of those who have reported are finding
success in the job market.

According to Placement Office statistics, 100 percent of
the 1977 graduate who reported back have found jobs.
This compares with 95.3 percent in 1976 and 88 percent
in 1975.

Unfortunately, the number of non-reporting graduates
is also following a rising trend. 31.4 percent of the class
of 1977 have not responded, compared with 30 percent
in 1976 and 18 percent in 1975. For the first time, however,
the Placement Office is attempting to rectify this lack of
information. Return-address post cards are being sent to
non-reporting graduates and other potential sources of in-
formation are being exploited. The results of the follow-up
are expected to be released in the spring.

Statistically, 41.5 percent of the reporting 1977
graduates found jobs with law firms while 20.2 percent are
now employed by the federal government. The third
largest category of employment was judicial clerkships,
comprising 12.9 percent. The statistics also indicate a
continuing trend towards corporate law firms.

Although the statistics look promising, the Placement
Office cautions that the job market continues to be tight.
Although more graduates find jobs in D.C. than elsewhere
across the country, job prospects outside of D.C. are good.
Job opportunities in some of the less popular cities, such as
Atlanta, Dallas, Detroit, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and St.
Louis, literally go begging.

In order to be counted as one of the “employed”, a
graduate has to report that he or she has been hired for a
full-time job that the graduate believes will be on a poten-
tially permanent basis. The employment category does not,
however, distinguish between those jobs that are legal and
those that are non-legal.

WHERE THE JOB FINDERS FOUND JOBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkships</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 100% 100% 100% 100%

Number of jobs found in D.C. 40% 50 175 197

CLASS OF 1977 PLACEMENT CHART

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law firms</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Clerkships</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local Government</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative, Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; Graduate Study</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clerkships

(continued from page 1)

class of "I8 obtained clerkships on their
own, without the formal assistance of the
Committee. These figures reflect a decline
from the class of 1977, of whom 53 grad-
uates, or 12.9 percent of the class, secured
judicial clerkships, according to the Place-
ment Office's Guide to Legal Careers.

Clerkship Committee Chairperson Prof.
Paul Rothstein, acknowledges problems in
the Committee's operation this year, but
disagrees sharply with Hutchinson's con-
cclusions. "I think he's wrong," Rothstein
stated in a telephone interview. "I think it
[Hutchinson's recommendation that the
committee be abolished] stems from not
understanding what the Clerkship Commit-
tee is doing."

Rothstein noted that he was not on a
full-time Law Center retainer this summer,
and hence was not around when the pro-
blems started cropping up. "The clerkship
secretary had a very severe personal pro-
blem this summer which coincided with the
renovation of the Secretariat offices," Rothstein stated. The professor stated he
was not at liberty to say what the nature
of the secretary's personal problem was.

Rothstein noted that with the Committee
serving as the Law Center's "central clear-
inghouse" for judicial clerkship informa-
tion, the burden on the secretary is "re-
nemous." Rothstein stated that he would
favor measures to insure that "the failabil-
ity of one secretary would not foul up the
whole process."

Among the measures Rothstein said he
would be willing to support are an increase
in the Committee's staff support, or a step
toward putting the student "on his own,"
retaining the committee as a backup re-
source.

Hutchinson told the Law Weekly, "Names and blame are not what's impor-
tant here. What's important is that the ap-
paratus we've created doesn't work."

Placement Director Sue Sullivan had re-
ceived a copy of Hutchinson's report to the
Dean when she was contacted by the Law
Weekly. "My philosophy has always been
that if the program needs revamping to
help the students, then let's try it," Sulli-
van stated. She added, "I think our office
could serve the informational function
much better than the Committee. But that's
always been their area and we've tried not
to step on their toes."

One student who used the Committee ap-
paratus this summer commented, "I think the
idea of having all the information to-
gether -- the writing sample, the resume,
the recommendations -- is a great conven-
tience to the students. If I had to send all
that stuff out to 45 judges and I only ap-
plied to New York judges -- I don't know
what I'd do." However, the student noted,
"I don't know if the judges got my pack-
age. I assume they did. I do know they
didn't hire me."

According to sources close to the Dean,
McCarty will be calling a meeting of the
Clerkship Committee in the near future to
discuss Hutchinson's report. In a telephone
interview, McCarthy stated, "If we abol-
ished the Committee without replacing it
with something else -- obviously we won't
do that -- the faculty would want to be
consulted. However, if we were to replace
the present apparatus with something else,
I would probably do that myself."
A first year and an upperclass student's perspective

By JOHN GALLO

It could have been almost any first year student in the country. For that matter, it could have been any first year law student at Georgetown. The scene was certainly familiar: an anxious student scrambles out of bed for his first day of classes, throws a book pack over his shoulder, rides his bike through the city streets, and runs into Constance late to hear about the baby band in Hawkins V. McGee.

The writers of The Paper Chase know about as much about law school as the average law student knows about the television industry—perhaps less. At least in its first episode, the show was incredibly superficial in its treatment of such time-honored school institutions as study groups and the Socratic method. Nothing in the first script suggested anything approaching research on the part of the writers beyond a chance encounter with a law student on a Hollywood bus stop. Oh, they do know the names of the courses in the first-year curriculum—they even throw in a case name or two—but they miss the really overwhelming aspect of law school: not power, but pressure. A sense of urgency, a frightening lack of time, a feeling that a three-year race for high stakes has begun; all these things are missing. There is no aspect of chase; all we have seen is beaten paper.

Such misconceptions as to subject matter might be tolerable, even forgivable, if the creators of the show had not given it a protagonist who is a reincarnation of Jerry Ford, supplemented by a pocket-part of paranoia. James T. Hart, our hero, seems unable to carry books, ride a bicycle, or even chew gum when accompanied by the tension and emotional discomforts associated with law school and constant, unceasing, and therefore largely environmental: after a while, almost all law students get accustomed to it. They become as much a part of daily life as the constant Murak to which office workers are subjected. But that unrelenting sense of intense hassle cannot be communicated to the television viewer who drops in casually for one hour a week, and pursues a normal existence during the remaining 167 hours. Television can capture the embarrassment caused by professorial hazing of first year students while still missing the real impact such hazing has on the individual: it’s not so much the embarrassment before peers that hurts, but that the humiliation takes the form of a direct attack on the student’s ego. The individual student victim remembers the assault long after classmates forget about the entire scene. That distinction, however, is probably too subtle for a medium whose best efforts at entertainment include such a psychological tour de force as Leverance & Shepoy.

If we get lucky, Mr. Hart just might fail all his pre-Christmas exams.

By RINZY WILLIAMS

The Muhammad Ali Show

Moving?

Don't forget your mail. A month before you move pick up a free Change of Address Kit from your Post Office or letter carrier. Mail the cards to your bank, charge accounts. Everyone.

Financial Aid Announcement

The Committee on Student Aid announces that there is a very limited amount of University Scholarship funds available for this current academic year. All students (first year and upperclass) who have already filed a FAFSA with the Office of Financial Aid and who are interested in appealing their financial aid decision should see either Linden Tucker or Joyce Hensley, the Financial Aid Officers, to inquire about the mandatory requirements for the appeal process. You may submit written requests for consideration for these financial aid funds from September 11th through September 22nd to the Office of Financial Aid.

P.S. The GU FISL application deadline (7% loans through the school) is Monday, September 25.
By KEITH R. FISHER

In a remote corner of the world, the cold war rages on, and each of the warriors, after two more months of combat, remains as fiercely determined to win as he was at the start. The winner will be crowned chess champion of the world.

More than a title is at stake. Since his defection from the Soviet Union two years ago, Viktor Korchnoi has been an outspoken critic of the Soviet system of government and its acts of oppression. He has good cause to be bitter: despite repeated requests by Western chess officials and certain government representatives, the Russians have stubbornly refused to permit Korchnoi's wife and family to leave the country. In contrast, the reigning champion Anatoly Karpov enjoys the support of the massive Soviet chess bureaucracy. The 27-year-old Moscovite gained the title by default when Bobby Fischer refused to participate in the scheduled 1975 match. The reason behind this decision is the irony of subsequent events some time into the modular operandi of the Soviet Chess machine.

FIDE (Fédération Internationale des Échecs) is the organization which regulates chess structure and rules the title of world champion. Starting in 1948, former world champion Mikhail Botvinnik became champion, the following rules were in force: (1) The match consists of 24 games. If the score is tied at 12-12, the champion retains the title. Winning a game gives 1 point to the winner and 0 to the loser; a draw gives 1/2 point to each player. (2) If the champion loses the match, he is entitled to a rematch the following year. Botvinnik made good use of the second clause twice in his career, winning matches against Smyslov and Tal. In the 1963 Botvinnik-Petrosian match, however, the rematch clause was expanded, and Petrosian won free and clear. Nevertheless, match rules still favored the incumbent since, to remain champion, he needed only 24 draws and did not have to win a single game.

Then, in 1972, after winning the title from Boris Spasky and becoming the first non-Russian champion in 45 years, Bobby Fischer proposed to eliminate the champion's advantage of retaining the title by drawing every game with the following rules: (1) The first player to win ten games wins the match. (2) If both players win nine games, the champion retains his title. (3) Draws do not count in the scoring, and there is no limit on the number of games.

Fischer's proposals were rejected, primarily because of strong and determined Soviet opposition to anything he suggested. In his rage and frustration, Fischer decided to participate further in FIDE competition and has not played in a public tournament since. However, the Soviets demonstrated the strength of their principles at the 1978 FIDE convention in Caracas, where Karpov proposed and obtained the following match conditions: (1) The first player to win six games wins the match. (2) Draws do not count in the scoring, and there is no limit on the number of games. (3) If the champion loses, he is entitled to a rematch the following year.

Grandmaster Kavalek, the 1978 U.S. Champion, recently observed, "This time it is the rematch clause that makes the regulations absolutely ridiculous. For Karpov to meet a new challenger in 1981 in defense of the title FIDE handed him in 1975, he has to do it in six games - in the re-match. He doesn't need even a single win in the first match... an incomparably more advantageous situation for Karpov than for any previous champion. Even more surprising than that these proposals were accepted by FIDE is that Karpov was praised for it. At the same time, it seems that the critics of Fischer's proposals of a few years ago have suddenly become very quiet."

The present match in the Philippines has not been free from acrimony. The most hotly-disputed issue has been the presence of Dr. Vladimir Zakhar, a noted Russian parapsychologist, who sat in the front row of the auditorium and stood at Korchchnoi's side during the early games. Claiming that Khar- ztar was trying to hypnotize him, Korchnoi demanded that he be removed to the back of the hall. In each successive game, however, Zakhar moved up one row at a time, apparently in an effort to distract the challenger. It is only Korchnoi's threats of physical violence that have curbed these antics, at least for the time being.

The 20th game of the match exemplifies the incredible abilities of both men to play exciting, dynamic chess, as well as the dull, null they share with lesser mortals - the capacity for error.

"Trial by one win to four, Korchchnoi voluntarily accepted a weakening of his Kingside pawn structure in order to produce an asymmetrical position giving chances for both players to win. Short of time in the crucial position (each player has 2 1/2 hours in which to play the first 40 moves), Korchnoi overlooked the possibility of Karpov's 32nd move. Playing 31...P-N3, he had expected 32 QXP, N-K5, after which the increase of Black's King's attack produces an unclear position which would make White's small material advantage irrelevant. Karpov delayed taking the RP by first playing 32 Q-R4, preventing Black's Knight from playing to its K5 and forcing it to move to an inferior square. Playing with devastating accuracy, Karpov stifled Korchnoi's counterplay and left him in a hopeless position when the game was adjourned. Korchnoi then spent 30 minutes in thought before sealing his 42nd move in an envelope, to be opened when play resumed the following day. However, the sealed move was a crucial mistake, which allowed Korchchnoi to produce a drawn position after some subtle play. Simply 42 QXP seems to win for White, but Black has no way to prevent the advanced white pawns from queening.

Having neatly liquidated Rook and minor piece endgame, Korchchnoi forced the draw with 61...R XP. 62 R-K8c, K3; 63 R-N7c, N-Q4, then Q-N7 completely ties White's pieces, where any other move by the White king allows..."
Interviewed by GODWIN OYEWOLE

Is it true that you are a "wolf in wolves' clothing"? I must say that at the end of a busy day I feel like one. I do think that professors should not be in sheep's clothing. I think they should come across as fairly firm and demanding and serious. As far as what's inside the clothing, I feel that's the professor's private affair to some extent. My own guess is that most of us would guess wrong about their professors. I don't really know the answer to this.

You are one of the busiest professors around here. In addition to your teaching load, you are also the Director of the Institute of International and Foreign Trade Law.

There are times I don't get the name of the Institute right.

It's a keyboards thing. When I say a word like "foreign" it's an English translation of our German Institute in Frankfurt.

You are also a co-director of the Investment Negotiations Center. That's the Chairman of the International Law Section of the ABA, a co-director of the law school's joint J.D./M.B.A. program, that with the School of Foreign Service on the Main Campus, the Foreign Student Advisor at the Law Center and the Faculty Advisor to Law and Business, and the editor of the International Journal of the Law Center. In addition, you find time to write. There are only 24 hours in a day and seven days in a week. How do you find time to do all these things, and more?

There are many answers to that question. For example, one way to do a lot of things is to do a lot of them badly. That is always a danger. The other way to do a lot of things is not badly, but to cut corners. I try not to cut corners. You can sometimes do some things more efficiently than others. I think the real key is that you yourself should take care of those things you can only do yourself. Like teaching, you can't do anything else for your classes, meeting with your students. But institutional matters, like much of the work of the Institute for International & Foreign Trade Law, can be delegated. And the problem is that you become your own supervisor. Ditto with the ABA. I was Chairman-elect of the International Law Section and Chairman this year. The thing I have given most attention to, or as much as anyone, and I probably did a surprising thing for a professor, not to go to the substantive, although I am very interested in that, but the management. Streamlining the operations, testing out committees, delegating profound decisions and supervising. I think that is really the key and in a way it is a marvelous natural for a professor because if it gives you more time to be involved more in the substantive aspect of what you are doing. Some people are geniuses at administr- ation. Some are good at being part of being able to get a lot of things done is delegation.

The other part is working long hours. I have a very understanding wife who herself works very long hours, namely, taking care of our children.

Are the children in international business?

Yes. They are still very young. Alexandra, the oldest, is not yet thirteen. Sarah is eleven and Benjamin was ten last Tuesday September 12. They all go to school. Actually the busiest time for my wife is when the children are not in school.

Do you work at home much? I do. Actually in the evening and on weekends. But I always draw the line at some point and do some reading outside the law. I think if you preserve your outside interest in the same way it gives you a kind of perspective on your professional work, and, ironically, it enables you to do your professional work more efficiently. What type of reading? I am sure you are not talking about The Wall Street Journal.

Oh, I must say, on magazines, when I was much younger, at one time or another subscribed to every magazine and every one of which I've read. Basically I have dropped them all. I read the Economist each week, if I can get it. I read the New York Times. I was brought up in New York, and I also think it is a very nice organized paper, and I don't read magazines. For example, my reading this summer; I read a book about Binnever, the Iron Chancellor, who by the way was "half wolf in half wolf" clothing." He was much more complicated than people know. I read a very good book about the Hapsburg monarchy by E.J.P. Taylor, and I am now reading a book called The Struggle For Mastery in Europe, a book about 19th century diplomatic history, also by E.J.P. Taylor. My brother is editor-in-chief of Holt, Rhinehart & Winston in New York, and he send me books all the time. I have the second volume of the autobiography of Anthony Poc which I am reading, I am reading the third volume of Richard Crossman's diaries which my brother bought out, and my wife sends the New Yorker regularly, which my brother gives me for Christmas and my wife is always passing it on to me to read. I think it is very important to read outside the profession. One thing we do not do very much because of our children, as much as anything, is that we don't go out very much.

But you entertain at home.

Yes, we do, and that is another thing. I grew up in New York where people go out a lot. In Washington, you go out to people's houses and they come to your house. Anyway, I think it is very important that you do not allow yourself to be totally consumed by your work even if you work very hard. I think in the end you become a very efficient worker. I know that sounds like saying your cake and eating it too. But I think there is something to it.

Although you grew up in New York, you were born in Vienna, Austria, of American parents.

My father came to the United States after WW I, married my mother who was from Boston, went back to Austria where he worked for an American company. My brother and I were both born in Vienna. As a little boy, I saw Hitler with my own eyes come to Vienna. We spent our summers in the States and later moved to the States. I grew up in New York and in Massachusetts. I went off to boarding school and to college and came back to practice law in New York. I didn't come to Washington until 1962 when I came to work for the government, the AID. I was here for a year, then I went overseas, Turkey, for two years as the Regional Legal Advisor for the Middle East, and we have been here ever since. We are very happy here, we really love it a great deal. I spent my sabbatical year, 1973-74, in Oxford.

You mean, you left a lucrative law practice in New York to come to Washington?

Not quite. I was still a young lawyer. I think I left a prospectively lucrative practice. The reason being, and I am very clear about it in retrospect, one works terribly hard in New York. Enjoyed practicing. I admired by law firm tremendously. It was an excellent firm. You work very hard. I have always enjoyed a broad intellectual interest and I thought that if I was going to work that hard, I'd rather work on some of these broader interests. I was always fairly unstable about law school. Between my second and third years at Harvard Law School I took leave of absence and went to England and studied at the London School of Oriental and African Studies. At my first year of practice with Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, I left again and returned to Harvard where I enrolled in the Ph.D. program and studied African Government, and worked as a Research Assistant to Professor Paul Freund of Harvard Law School. So, I was always here all these other interests. But I must say that when I left New York law practice nobody was surprised. They sort of gave me the international experience which I continued. I make no legal training, but I continued to be active in law because I have been able to combine the law and international interests rather unusually here at Georgetown. I have worked out very well, but it took me a long time to get there.

Not too long ago, you headed an ABA delegation to the People's Republic of China.

No. I didn't head the delegation. At a matter of fact, it was almost one of the junior people on it.

I thought being the Chairman of the International Law Section of the ABA you would have been a member of any group.

What happened was that the ABA received two invitations. One was for the International Law Section, that group in going in November. I guess I could have been there, but in fact Hon. Justice Frankfurter, the Chairman, is heading it. The other invitation came to the president of the ABA. A group was selected and was selected to go with that group. It was a rather attractive invitation. The Chinese offered to pay all international expenses while we were in China.

It is impossible to be an expert on any country in the world after a very brief visit like you had. There is a difference in the delivery of legal services between China and the U.S. I have touched on a really complicated and fascinating topic. One thing you learn on a trip like this is how little you know. Speaking to a legal observer, it is almost impossible to exaggerate the differences between the two systems. We were given a book to read, by way of briefing, by Professor Victor Lee at Stanford University Law School, an American of Chinese origin. It is a book he wrote about the Chinese legal system in the People's Republic of China, called Law Within Law. He described the Chinese legal system, and think you can almost say it is a country within a country, within a lawyer, or at least as we know it. In many ways there is a legal system in China. The issue of the delivery of legal systems almost doesn't arise. The Chinese don't believe in interpretation of law by law in the way we do. I know. This is not because of some mystery to me that Chinese culture is very different but because of their traditional cultural origins. I am not an expert on Asian culture. I am no longer a student of the Chinese, but as a social scientist working on Asian cultures as well. This resolution by negotiation and mediation may also be present in many African and Muslim countries. In China, a centralized civil branch suggests bad behavior. The society is ashamed of bad behavior, you try to recognize and correct but as a system, which is wrong, to confess, to improve themselves. You don't go the Indian way, you don't go to a stranger to reveal your failure. However, the Chinese did begin to adapt some Western codes in the '20s and '30s, but to some extent that period was anticipated because of the fall of the Nationalists. The third model was Russia. Now they do not particularly like the Russians. They do want to develop a legal system of one kind or another. It probably would look like ours, but for other reason, as we were told, than to control the activities of their officials. As far as crimes go, they really try to get the individual to confess. They have a saying, "We would treat a person who makes a good confession lessently, we would treat a person who does not confess severely." They say that openly. There is nothing Marxist about it, it's the way they look at it. And this is the trial situation that was really a sentencing procedure. It was pretty much under the control of the judge, on the European model. The judge was surrounded by two lay assessors. The defendant who was accused of theft had real good defense. The judge and his assessors were an open dossier. They knew pretty much what the case was, when it was going to end up, and what the result should be. The open proceedings were for our entire people in the audience. The Chinese follow what is called
it's all part of the show

"naive line." The judge asks the audience what the sentence should be. In America, I think this would be an utterly horrendous thing. In China, it had a certain plausibility.

But I can't imagine 400 people all telling the judge what the sentence should be.

Well, it was not quite like that. The judge came to the audience and asked about thirty people to speak. My guess is that most of them came from the factory, or the garage - the defendant was a bus driver - the workplace as the Chinese call it, or from his neighborhood. In China, when someone commits a crime his peers become offended, if in fact he is guilty. Of course whether or not he is guilty is something one will never know by our standards. But if they are satisfied that he has done something wrong, then they begin to talk about how to reform him, to find out why he did it. To get him to agree never to do it again. My guess is that his peers decide what the sentences should be. In fact the judge pretty much decides. And the judge also gets the opinion of his or her supervisor. The system is not all like ours.

We also went to a civil proceeding. It was not a trial, it was a divorce mediation proceeding held in a court house, with a judge and two lay assessors. The system was borrowed from the Russians but didn't quite work the same way. They were not really jurors, but lay people who sat on the bench for a year hearing various cases, or were specially assigned to a particular case. They usually come from the work place of the defendant or the neighborhood. In this divorce proceeding, it was a foregone conclusion that there was going to be a divorce, which is very rare in China where, so an American family lives very strong. Divorce is frowned upon, but here there was an irreparable breach, and at issue was the custody of the children. And then there was the endless discussion about, and constant references to, whether or not the husband or the wife behaved properly, did they agree that they were going to improve themselves. There was no application of norms or standards or even procedure. It was more a matter of getting good results. Whether or not a good result came out of this case was a real question. They gave the custody of one child to the father, and that of another to the mother. A decision I don't think the Americans in the audience liked.

Again, traditionally, the Chinese do not seem to believe in third party objective adjudication. Later on came the Norwegians who tried to "moderate" and "reform" things. But they got discarded. And the Russians have been discarded. Then came what was a horrendous thing for the Chinese. The Chinese now acknowledge in a very surprising way that they have many problems outside the legal system. The legal system is not the main problem. They blame their main problem on "the gang of four" and the late Lin Piao. But many people in China say the problems really started with the "cultural revolution" in 1966. The "cultural revolution" apparently had the effect of really disrupting, if not destroying, many of the formal institutions in China, labor unions, the office of the procurator, who is the prosecuting attorney, which I gathered almost ceased to exist. I think the police were seriously disrupted although much criminal justice which was done was done through administration by the police or political people. It disrupted almost all institutions including economic institutions; research institutions were destroyed. We visited the University of Peking law faculty, which I think was closed down for four years in the late 60's or early 70's. The faculty remained, but there were no student. The Law Institute, which is probably the principal source of the codification of law, a sort of high powered think tank, producing legislation, was stuck in its tracks for ten years or more, which is quite a tragedy as many Chinese now acknowledge. They are really open about it, I think because they can blame the "gang of four" and Lin Piao. The result is that, for example, the marriage law which might be the source of standards for divorce and custody just wasn't worked on for the last ten years or more. Also they have no current, relevant, effective criminal code or civil code; so to some extent the judges are guided by bulletins and informal understanding. I found the communication, maybe by political party direction. I don't mean to misstate that, but now they are trying to develop all these.

Does that mean they have no use for familiar things like law schools, lawyers, and judges?

They do have judges, of course. They have a four-tier system of courts. The grassroots courts which are the trial courts, an intermediate Appeals Court, the higher level Appeals Court and the Supreme Court. Their relationship to each other is very different from our own. In many ways it's almost like a hierarchy within a corporation. Those judgeships must be filled by what the Chinese call "law

(continued on page 9)
en More Don Wallace

By PAUL KLEINENBERG

From a survey of Washington law book stores the Law Weekly has compiled a chart listing the prices various law bookstores charge for new casesbooks required for courses at the Law Center. The chart includes the Harvard Law Book Co, 3, Coursiers, Inc., and Washington Law Book prices. For various reasons, the data is not always complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASEBOOK</th>
<th>AUTHOR(S)</th>
<th>PUBLISHER</th>
<th>HARVARD CATALOG</th>
<th>LERNER LAW BOOK</th>
<th>WASHINGTON LAW BOOK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Civil Procedure</td>
<td>Field, Kaplan &amp; Cleary</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commercial &amp; Consumer Law</td>
<td>Spiegel, Summers &amp; White</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contracts</td>
<td>Gamber</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Criminal Law</td>
<td>Cameron &amp; Paulson</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>Press</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, then, it is at least some what comforting to know that we are not the unwitting victims of a high percentage markup in the retail book industry. If anyone is making a mint, it must be either the professors who write the books or (more likely) the publishers who put out the books.

Support for Nisio's views, and especially for a Committee on Minorities, was strong. "This is a hell of a time, especially with (Assistant Dean and Admission Director David G.) Wilkins leaving, to be down grading these committees," said one SBA delegate. "We should negotiate with the Dean on this point."

In making the motion for the vote on the committees, which carried unanimous, third year delegate James Cain observed that "It's a good idea to keep these committees." Noting that student representatives on the Committee on Minorities had traditionally been minorities themselves, Cain added that "these people can get together and set out their own goals."

Gerald Elliott, another delegate, was less than enthusiastic about saving the Minorities Committee. "The kinds of issues such committees would rate would cut across the board of all the others. My understanding is that these committees haven't done anything in the last few years."

That observation, however, lost out to political considerations. Pat Menonastle, another third year delegate, said that once the committees were abolished, "they would be hard to start up again." Another delegate expressed concern that minorities "could get shot out of every committee unless we reserve a space for them."
Red wine
Give that red wine plenty of breathing room

By BOB NICHOLS
Copyright 1978 © by Bob Nichols

Until two years ago, everyone agreed that (1) most red wines improve before being drunk, and (2) the only red wines that deteriorate with more than a few minutes of breathing time are those that are very old.

Then several well-known experts in the wine community wrote an article for New York magazine that ostensibly exploded the myth that it is valuable to air red wines. The article was highly unsatisfactory in that it described the results of an actual experiment, rather than rehearsing traditional wine knowledge.

What the experts did was this: they took several types of wine and, in some cases, blended two bottles of each. One bottle was air-aged for as long as two hours, the other opened just before drinking. To everybody's surprise, the experts invariably preferred the wine that had just been opened to the one that was allowed to breathe.

Then was a new myth that red wine does not need air. This myth is untrue. How and in what manner a wine should be aerated is a complex subject, although it is rarely depicted as such in wine books. Usually what you read is simplified to keep the wine novice out of trouble until he learns enough to use his own judgment.

The over-simplifications come in four varieties:
1. You don't need to air your wine. The theory is that almost no wine, red or white, needs air to be drinkable. But the theory ignores that many wines, particularly expensive reds, improve dramatically if allowed to breathe.
2. Always allow your wine to breathe 15 to 30 minutes before drinking. It is true that almost no wine, red or white, will become undrinkable if it airs for this short time, and many wines will improve.
3. A longer time (15 to 30 minutes) is rarely adequate to develop those wines that must need air, and many excellent wines can bloom and die in 30 minutes.
4. Never allow your wine to breathe because wine usually tastes better after it has been opened. This is the approach of the New York magazine experts. The problem with this rule is that it is too large a blank to fill. If you do not open the bottle in advance, then this approach may be valid; however, the idea of allowing a wine to breathe depends not only on how long you air the wine, but also on the manner of airing the wine. More about these four over-simplifications, I hereby add a fifth.

5. The more or brown or black the edges of a red wine relative to its body, the less the wine needs to be aerated. The problem of this over-simplification is that it really isn't simple.

First, you need to know about edges and body. "Body" has two meanings. For purposes of color, the body of a wine is the bulk of the wine as you view it in a glass. (The other meaning concerns the wine's thickness or viscosity.) The "edges" or "edge" describes the circle around the wine's body where the upper surface meets the sides of the glass.

Second, you need to be aware of the meaning of color differences in red wines. Ordinarily the color of a red wine at the edges is different from the color in the body, either more purple, more orange, or more brown. (For a general discussion of color in red wines, see "Pay attention to color" in the April 1978 issue of the Georgetown Law Weekly, Vol. 13, No. 26, page 1.)

Third, you need to know how much air should be given to each wine relative to its color. The novice can't expect to know all the nuances involved in making this sort of decision because he doesn't have the necessary experience. Fortunately, there is a rule of thumb to help. Unfortunately, even this rule of thumb requires a bit of memorizing. It is summarized in the RED WINE BREATHING TIME table (see the box on this page).

There are three common ways to allow wine to breathe. The one apparently used by the New York magazine experts is the most common, but it doesn't work very well. This method is to pull the cork and then open the bottle stand upright during the breathing period. Not enough oxygen gets in to the wine this way because only a small portion of wine in the neck of the bottle is exposed to the air. For red wines that really need air to improve, this is akin to trying to fill a bathtub by using a chimp. Of the two other methods, the tried and true approach is to decant the wine (pour it from the bottle into a carafe), and allow the wine to breathe in the carafe.

Wine is aired because chemical changes occur when it comes in contact with oxygen. If wine is too young, air will increase its acidity. If wine is too noble, it will make it mellow. If the wine is too tannic, it will become less tannic. If there is not much nose (smell), the bouquet will flower. If the wine tastes colored (not much flavor), the flavor will increase. But, if the wine is at its best already, air can only destroy it.

The major exception to this whole article is in reds, particularly those from California or New York. Most of these wines have been stabilised to inhibit chemical changes from exposure to air. With such wines you need only to pull the cork — or rather, uncork the cap — and pour.

WALLACE

(continued from page 8)

class that: "It's my job to make the quiet noisy and the noisy quiet." Some students are just too confident for the good of the profession. They have to be restrained. Others are too bashful. However, my premise is the same in the first and in later years. A student has to teach himself or herself. All we can do is to provide the opportunity and hope he or she will get going.

Incidentally, I don't feel that everyone in the first year of law school has to be a lawyer. I think a lot of people probably don't want to be lawyers. I don't have any feeling that I want to force anybody to be a lawyer. But I do feel that if anyone wants to be a lawyer, we in the first year should help him or her. With second and third year students, my approach is very different. I think that the subject is more important. I teach in the international field, lots of the material here, at least as a lawyer should know it, is not known to students before, and I think that much more, I don't use the question and answer very much at all. I feel I have a lot of ground to cover. In my seminars, of course, there is a great deal of student participation. There I go a little bit back to the sort of joshing which sometimes we have in the first year. But again in the second and third years I think one should focus more on subjects, I think in the first year one has the responsibility, in a way, to really orient the student into the legal world and help him or her to orient his or her thinking and to really get him or her in to the real legal thinking processes started right.

What do you think students, especially first year students, think of you?

I once had an oral critique session for a class of eighty students. It was not a first year class. I remember one student saying to me, "I wonder why you do it all the time, why do you stand while you lecture to the red?" I was first beginning to teach, and you sit because you tend to look at your notes, I like to sit. After class another student came to me and told me that he would be very distracted if you stood and walked back and forth. That rather odd experience taught me a lesson that for every direction there is one in the other. And the result is that I have decided that a professor has to have confidence in himself, and I never forget that my job is to teach students, think that I, to a large extent, have to be the principal source of how I do it. I listen to the students for the time. I have quite a lot of students and ex-students who are my friends, but I don't think that a professor has to lock over his shoulder and trim his tail to immediate student opinion. I don't think a professor should be overly guided by the opinions of students who for the first time are being exposed to the legal profession, and are under pressure. I don't want to sound too paternalistic, so I am not going to say any more.

Is it possible that someday GULC will be known as the place to go to study international law?

It already has a very good reputation in the international field. And I have anything to do with it, that reputation should grow and grow and grow. It has had excellent professors in the past in the field of international law, and I am hoping we will have many more in the immediate future. Also activities in the international field on the Main Campus have been helpful in establishing our reputation, and being in Washington where we have many international agencies to which people come from all over the world, there is no reason why we cannot just be fantastically good in international law and I'd like to think that we are moving in that direction already.
Fix it or junk it

The ambitious goals of the Clerkship Committee are beyond its present resources. It's promise to promptly and efficiently provide interested judges with all of the background data they could possibly want concerning Georgetown clerkship applicants has in many cases gone unfulfilled. The Committee's corollary responsibility to provide Georgetown students with comprehensive and reliable information about the clerkship opportunities available has also, it seems, been neglected. The tasks the Committee has undertaken are weighty, too weighty to place on the shoulders of a single administrative secretary.

The choice is between increasing the staff resources of the Committee to a level commensurate with its responsibilities, or replacing the present clerkship placement process with one that places more of the application workload on the individual students concerned. For a number of reasons, we agree with Professor Hutchinson's conclusion that the later course is preferable.

It is important to remember that, when discussing judicial clerkship opportunities, one is talking primarily, in conventional academic terms at least, about the top 20 percent of the Law Center student body. This is the same group that derives the major benefit from the tuition-financed law journals, the Placement Office's interview program, and the institution of Dean's List and graduation honors. There is a limit to the portion of Law Center tuition the other 80 percent can be expected to contribute to the subsidization of these students' placement efforts.

On the other hand, it should also be remembered that the placement of Georgetown graduates in judicial law clerk positions does more than any other kind of placement to enhance the general reputation of the school, and indirectly, its student body. Judicial law clerks often go on to become law school teachers and administrators—enhancing the reputation of Georgetown in the eyes of their students and their colleagues. To this extent, all Georgetown law students benefit from the placement of a Georgetown graduate in a judicial clerkship.

The vice of the present structure is that it relieves those with the most to gain from a successful application effort of primary responsibility for seeing that that effort is successful. The virtue of the Committee apparatus is that it provides interested judges with a reliable and comprehensive analysis of the applicants' abilities.

The Law Weekly believes that the present structure can be replaced with one that eliminates the vice without sacrificing the virtue. The burden of seeing that the application package is complete and promptly delivered should rest on the student applicant. The Clerkship Committee should limit its responsibility to that of providing an official, comprehensive and reliable evaluation of the applicant's abilities.

Letters to the Editor

"Regular" is racist

To the Editor:

I noted with horror the Law Weekly staff's use of the terms "regular" and "minority" in the charts of "Minorities came back to GULU" (September 11, 1979). The implication that minority students are in some way "irregular" is tantamount to racism. Surely, with a little thought, a more appropriate label could have been found. It seems ironic that a paper which prides itself in its quality of journalism could be so insensitive.

Alison Kohler
Class of 1981.

Shades of Tristan Tzara!

To the Editor:

I was thrilled to read Javade Chaudri's piece on Muhammad Ali in last Monday's Law Weekly. I hadn't thought that a single hero of the classic could have survived in the boxing world.

Indeed, where are the bold existentialists who painted sweeping strokes on the surrealistic canvas of world politics-media sports? I remember Mugs Sarre, back in the Sixties—a class existentialist who could deck Leon Spinks in less time than it takes to kayak the death-of-God theory. Unfortunately, Mugs was kind of weak on his surrealistici sweeping strokes. He was more at home with the short shorts representative of Cubism exemplified by middleweight Emile Griffith.

Spinks's manager called me in for a little consultation, and I could tell as a glance that the kid had enough aesthetic muscle to put him in a class with Robin "Hurricane" Carter. But he had to work on those surrealistic strokes.

I put him through the paces, with special emphasis on brushwork, rope-a-dope, and theory, and the kid came along fast. I mean real fast. I mean, shades of Sugar Ray, or even Tristan Tzara!

We put him in the ring, for starters, with a tough punk named Terry Malone. No class. If he had ever pondered or painted, it was on a nineteenth century, strictly representational basis. Let's face it: his head looked like one of those Rene Magritte jobs an apple under a Bender hat and no brain.

Unfortunately, the punk was a Jehovah's Witness, and he promised Mugs for nine angry rounds, demanding "What's God's name" over and over again until our boy was splattered over the canvas like an early Jackson Pollack. Damn Witness's don't have any depth, but they can be overwhelming.

That's why I'm not as sure as Javade Chaudri that All will have washed over that pumpkin Spinks by the time this gets published next Monday. Sure, Leon's ontological framework might not have any bite to it, but let's face it, Ali's professional substance is beginning to look just a little bit worn. Ten rounds with Spinks, and Ali's gonna look like "Les Demoiselles du Avignon"—the one on the right, with the mohican... for a free. It's time for the imitable and unpredictable Ali to quit, while he's still pretty enough to look at without a lot of fancy justification from the philosophers.

Existentially yours,

Benny "The Kid" Spiliaza
More Letters

modest proposal

To the Editor:
Mr. Langer's self-serving analysis (Sept. 11 issue) of the knapsack-briefcase, near-radical-ichthyosaurs must be answered. The god of social and political revolution that generally resists the time to do your own thing, but maybe, at some point, to point out a time to look differ-
ently and by looking the same. Rather, I suggest that Mr. Langer's use of the brief-
case is more an example of the creeping Me-Generation of the 70's (as introduced by Time Wolf), and not pinned to any underlying justifying or justifying political or eco-
nomic theories. It is simply rampant, un-
bridled hedonism; now is the time to do your own thing because it is easier. That is the point, Mr. Langer. You owe a duty to your fellow students and you owe it impera-
tively, a duty to yourself. It is quite easier to "briefcase it", but shall we care for the only consultants? Consider goodwill through suffering. After all, isn't that why we're (first-year students) are here? It may also be true that you may own black socks, and on occasion, desire to wear them with your white tights (and you). You may also own a 100% polyester baby-blue leisure suit, matching pink shirt, white shoes and belt, but resist, Mr. Langer. As a friend, I urge you to return (until the end of the first year) to your knapsack.

Pat Rogers

Around the perimeter

Africa after Kenyatta—an uncertain legacy

By JAYADE CHAUDRI

Like the autumn leaves falling, the great leaders and giants of the post-war era have all passed on, leaving a new world and a vacuum that must be filled by a new genera-
tion. Their legacies will live through the chieftains, and will live on in the GULC community and the SJU students. Kenyatta was one of the great leaders of the African continent. His legacy is important for the stability and future of the continent. Kenyatta's legacy is the foundation for the future of Africa. He inspired the people of Africa to work together for a better future. Kenyatta's legacy is a lesson for us all. He taught us the importance of unity and cooperation. His legacy is a reminder that we must continue to work together for a better future for all.

Kenyatta's motto was Harambee, Swahili for "let's pull together", and all races and tribes joined in one of the most successful efforts of development and progress in Africa.

Africans stand at a crossroads. After the bitter conflict between the African states, they must find a way to work together. The continent of Africa is rich in resources, but it is also divided. The continent of Africa is divided into several nations, each with its own interests and goals. The continent of Africa must find a way to work together for the benefit of all.

What Kenya's legacy is, only the next few years will tell. In the end, Kenya's most important contribution may be his vision for the future. His vision for a continent that is united and prosperous is a lesson for us all. His legacy is a reminder that we must continue to work together for a better future for all.

The dinner, which was attended by many students, alumni, faculty, and adminis-
tration, received very good reviews in the informa-
tion about women-related events and health care facilities in the area. Last year, we were very fortunate in being able to bring to the GULC two excellent women speakers, Jill Wise-Vance, General Counsel to the Army and an activist in im-
proving the conditions of women in the Army, and Eleanor Smeal, the dynamic and effective president of NOW. In the early spring, we held our first Annual Susan B. Anthony dinner to commemorate the birthday of the famous suffragist. Our speaker was Barbara Babcock, Assistant Attorney General for the United States, and one of the most powerful and respected female attorneys in the country.

The opportunities for getting involved and making a difference in this town are almost unlimited. For example, the ERA extension, recently passed by the House, faces a difficult battle in the Senate. NOW and other groups have been organizing lobbying efforts and they need you. Other groups, such as NARAL, the Women's Legal Defense Fund and the National Women's Political Caucus all need volun-
teers. The W.R.C. can assist you in making contact with any of these groups.

The W.R.C. maintains affiliations with other student organizations at the Law Center and in the D.C. area. We are a member of the D.C. Women's Law Coaliti-

tion, a group comprising all D.C. area law schools, under whose banner we marched in the recent ERA March in D.C. last July. We also sponsored a local confer-
cence on Women and the Law with the Coalition last March. We have also sponsored a speaker with the National Women's Guild and a film with the Gay Law Students Association.

The W.R.C. is to be an active and meaningful organization. The only thing that can frustrate the achievement of this goal is if GULC women fail to participate. It is vitally important that we get ideas and assistance from as many women as pos-
ible. Please stop by, have a cup of coffee and get acquainted.

Budget

The budget of the SBA will be prepared by the Finance Committee. The budget will be presented to the SBA at its regular meeting in November. The budget will be based on the estimated expenses for the upcoming year. The budget will be discussed and approved by the SBA at its regular meeting in December. The budget will be presented to the students at the SBA meeting in January and will be approved by the students at the SBA meeting in February. The budget will be presented to the dean and the dean's office at the SBA meeting in March. The budget will be presented to the dean and the dean's office at the SBA meeting in April.
Res Pendens

From The Registrar

Credit/No Credit

The deadline for upperclass J.D. students to file K/NK elections for any course which begins in the Fall semester in Oct. 4. Forms are available at the Registrar's Office. Receipts will be issued when you submit your election.

Latest Address?

Be certain the Registrar has your proper address. Several important mailings will take place within the next few weeks and it is important that you take care to receive your mail. Your address will be in the Kiosk and 4th floor counter.

Evening Hours

The Registrar's Office will remain open until 8 p.m. on the following dates to accommodate evening and graduate students: Tuesday, Sept. 19, Wednesday, Sept. 27.

Graduate Students

Rules Governing Graduate Papers may be picked up at the Registrar's Office on the fourth floor. Please be certain your graduate papers are in these requirements.

I.D. Cards

Replacement I.D. cards will be made at the Law Center on Thursday, Oct. 12 from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. Replacement fee: $5.

From Placement

Group Meetings

The FTC will hold a group meeting for all students interested in learning about the Public and its recruitment process on Wednesday, Sept. 20 at 12:15-1:15 in Room 1B-32.

IRS Group Meeting Wednesday, Sept. 27 at 1:30 in Room 1B-18.

Resume Collection

Resume collection Tuesday and Wednesday, Sept. 19 and 20. Please note the resume to the schedule which is posted on the Placement Bulletin Board. Another Placement Newsletter will be available on Tuesday, Sept. 21 with more additions to the interview schedule.

Virginia Lawyers?

Interested in practicing in Virginia? The Virginia Bar Association Young Lawyers Section will have an informal meeting and answer your questions Friday, Sept. 22 at 12:30 to 1:30. All interested students (including first year) are invited.

Government Agencies

A number of government agencies have asked that all interested students submit resumes or applications through the Placement Office. These include SEC (before Sept. 29), FCC (Oct. 10), Dept. of Justice (Oct. 12) and HEW (Oct. 21). See Employer Request blank (Government section) for details.

Employer Requests?

Classes of 1980 & 1979—Have you used the Employer Request for Resumes? Employers are advising us they are not hearing from Georgetown students. The letters are filled by geographic area, and contacts should be made as soon as possible; specifically, Adler, Pollack, et al. in Providence; Butter, Binion, et al. in D.C.; Harte, Secrest, et al. in Rochester; N.Y., and Mitchell, Silberberg, et al. in L.A.

Interviews

Openings for interviews—Vorys, Sater, et al. in Columbus, Ohio has interview appointments available, particularly for Class of 1980, on Thursday, Sept. 28. Sign up in Placement Office.

Lottery for Alternates

In response to student suggestions, a lottery will replace the "first come first serve" procedure for alternates. Sign up begins at noon prior to the interview date.

GRIP

Students in the Classes of '79 and '80 may submit resumes for New York GRIP on or before Wed., Sept. 20 and sign up for an interview, Sept. 25-26; submit resumes for Philadelphia on or before Wed., Sept. 27 and sign up Oct. 2-6.

From the SBA

SBA Budget

There will be a question and answer session concerning the proposed SBA Budget bill on Friday, Sept. 22 from 11:15 in room 1B-18. We encourage all interested parties to attend.

Spring Papers

Papers submitted for the Spring Writing Competition will be available in the Tax Lawyer Office, 700 New Jersey Avenue, in the end of the day on Friday, Sept. 27. After Friday, all copies will be destroyed. Persons who are interested in retrieving their papers are urged to do so before Friday.

Student Activities

La Alianza

La Alianza de Derecho meeting is scheduled Wednesday, Sept. 20 at 3:30 p.m. in Room 7. To be discussed are upcoming events, future plans and more. All Latino Lawyers and Students are encouraged to attend.

Auditions

The Georgetown Gilbert & Sullivan Society will be producing "Hill by Jury" on Oct. 26-28. Director Cheryl Binkley will hold auditions for the remaining chorus positions on Tuesday evening, Sept. 26, at 7 P.M. in the Moot Court Room. The audition will consist of singing a song of your choice and some elementary pitch recognizion. Rehearsals begin around Oct. 12, so the time commitment is not that severe. In addition, we also will need a musical director, a costume person, and a prop person. Interested persons should get in touch with one of the co-producers weekday evenings: Jim Harris at 543-1357, or Patti Low at 483-7818.

Wine Tasting

The theme of this week's blind tasting will be France's California (boxed No. 78-919). Probably available will be a California Chardonnay and a French White Burgundy; a California Cabernet Sauvignon and a French Bordeaux; and a California Riesling and an Alsatian Riesling. Anyone who did not contribute money at last week's taking should bring some cheese and bread or crackers. Tuesday night, 8 P.M., Room 1B-33.

Gloryholes

Do you know what a Gloryhole is? It may be you! If you are a reasonably talented rock and roll musician, GLU's answer to the Rolling Stones may need you. We play at law school functions for fun and so keep us on the street. We especially need keyboards, and having your own equipment is a must. A.P.A. which we could borrow would be terrific.

Don't miss this opportunity to sign up and do in the world just how low you can sink. Five-year students: This means you! Put down those books and pick up your instrument; we guarantee it will keep you from going insane. Call Chase at 556-1647.

Jewish Appeal

Lois-Nan Kaye is the new law school contact for United Jewish Appeal Young Leadership. For information on programs and functions, call 546-1862.

U.S. Postal Service

GEOGGEOTOWN LAW WEEKLY

600 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001