Another journal suggested as fraud guard

By ANNA DOW

A faculty committee has recommended that another journal be established to ease the "pressure to cheat" to join the four law review reviews already at the Law Center.

The committee, formed to investigate the write-on competition scandal revealed last year by the Law Weekly, is redacting the recommendation after probing the situation involving the journals here. According to the story in the newspaper, there had been three incidents reported when students had become members of journals by cheats in the writing competition.

The investigation by the faculty committee did not discover any specific instances of cheating. After reviewing the situation, however, it did make some recommendations to the journals and to the administration.

The committee recommended that the law school faculty "seriously consider the creation of yet another law journal or some other outlet for sustained scholarly writing," according to the report. "Creation of a new journal or similar writing experience would not only accomplish important pedagogical goals, but more importantly, ... it might reduce the pressure to cheat by providing the journal experience to more students," the report continued.

The faculty was also asked to put the journal writing competitions under the academic honesty code and give the legal writing committee some responsibility for the writing competitions. The competitions, along with selection by grades, do determine who gets on the journals and who, therefore, gets the writing credits, the committee pointed out.

The committee also made some recommendations to the journals themselves. Presently all journals except the American Criminal Law Review have a two-step process. The first step is the grading of all the papers by readers randomly selected. Those given high marks are then read by the top-ranking editors. ACLR editors do all the work themselves, reading all the papers several times. The possibility of outside help — getting help from someone an expert on the subject — was more or less ruled out by the committee.

"In balance we concluded that the safeguards attendant to the journals' writing competitions are at least as great as those attendant to take-home examinations in ordinary courses," the report noted, striking down the need for strict preventive measures against outside help.

On the other hand, the committee described the possibility of inside help — (continued on page 5)

Writing requirement toughened

By MAURITA K. COLEY and PAUL KLEINBERG

The full faculty voted at a long meeting last Friday afternoon to significantly change the upperclass legal writing requirement.

After much debate, the faculty decided to require each student to complete one substantial piece of legal writing during the upperclass years. This one project would have to meet stricter guidelines than had been involved in past legal writing requirements.

The Academic Standards Committee had reported out to the faculty a proposal that the current requirement of two upperclass legal writing projects be "amplified to expressly provide that one of these two projects must be a seminar paper or equivalent." "Seminar paper or equivalent" means the Bauman report (6000 words, outline and draft, individual faculty supervision) as modified by the Fisher amendment (submitting a substantial piece of legal research to a faculty member for evaluation). The faculty voted to amend the committee proposal to require only one upperclass writing project, which would have to meet the Bauman-Fisher guidelines. The faculty then adopted the report, as amended.

The change will be effective with next year's entering first year class.

The new legal writing requirement may be met by a seminar, course, or clinic; an independent study program; or a law school activity (e.g., a journal). A seminar, course, or clinic will probably be approved for legal writing credit if:

1) it is sufficiently small (student/faculty ratio of 25:1 or better);
2) a faculty member supervises and reviews the selection and production of the paper; and
3) the paper is at least 6,000 words (approximately 25 typed pages). The Legal Writing Committee will have responsibility for designating a particular seminar, course, or clinic as meeting the legal writing requirement, and may deviate from the general standards where appropriate. In addition, the supervising professor must hand in two grades — one for the paper and one for the course, seminar, or clinic as a whole. Although the paper grade will not be used in figuring the student's grade point average, it will appear on the student's transcript. A law school activity may also meet the legal writing requirement. Examples include participation in any GULC journal. (continued on page 5)

Leahy finalists named

The finalists in the 1979 William E. Leahy Prize Argument are Kenneth Jost, Linda Halpern, David Garcia and Stephen Powell, the Barristers' Council announced Saturday. The finalists achieved the four highest weighted cumulative oral argument and brief scores in the two preliminary rounds and one semi-final round of the competition.

The four finalists were selected from the eight advocates who argued in the semi-final round before Associate Dean Frank Flegal, Professor Dennis Hutchinson, and GULC graduates Kathryn Fenton ('78) and David Burman ('77) Friday night. Fenton and Burman are both former Law Journal editors and are presently law clerks for U.S. District Judge Oliver Gasch and Associate Justice Byron R. White, respectively.

This year 22 upperclass students submitted briefs in the Leahy Competition, a record number according to Leahy Competition Coordinator Kevin Handy. The problem used in the Competition is based on the petition for certiorari in The New York Times Company v. Myron Farber v. The State of New Jersey and Mario Janscovich, filed in the Supreme Court last fall. The Supreme Court denied

Mondale to speak here

by GAIL GROSSMAN

Vice President Walter Mondale will make the opening remarks at the Street Law All Star Mock Trial Competition this Thursday April 26, at 10 a.m. in the moot court room. Vice President Mondale will be speaking on "The Importance of Teaching Law to Youth." The All Star Mock Trial competition is the culmination of the year long Street Law clinic, which teaches law to students in all of D.C.'s public high schools. Each year, every Street Law class from all the high schools in the District, compete against one another in the Mock Trial competition.

The high school students are coached by their Street Law teachers, who are law students at Georgetown participating in the clinic. This year, due to the teacher's strike, however, the participation in the mock trial has been somewhat limited. Some schools were able to participate, however, and the competition on Thursday is a combination of students from all different high schools who will be on two competing teams.

The case that will be argued is entitled "Ex parte in Matter of the Petition of Darryl Bryant for Adoption." The case involved the petition for adoption of a child, by the child's natural mother and stepfather. The respondent who is opposing the adoption is the child's natural father, and claims he has the right, as the natural father, not to be cut off from his child. The judge must decide what is in the best interest of the child when seeking to grant or deny the petition for adoption.

The presiding judge at the trial will be the Honorable Chief Judge Carl Malbran, who is Chief Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. (continued on page 5)
Around GULC
Faculty ups credit hours

By CHRYS ROGERS

On Wednesday, April 4, the faculty approved the Academic Standards Committee proposal to increase the number of credit hours from 81 to 83. This change will affect next year’s entering class only.

The faculty viewed the increase as a modest step toward completion of the long-range plan adopted by the Law Center in July, 1978. This plan envisions an overall substantive upgrading of the curriculum, with emphasis on the upperclass years, by increasing the number of credit hours to graduate, restricting the eight semester requirement for evening students and “breezing up” the legal writing requirement.

A goal of eighty-one credit hours is just above the minimum mandated by theABA and the AALS. The committee report reviews that other comparable law schools exceed this minimum standard, “although there are some ‘oranges and apples’ problems in the comparison.” For instance, Ohio State has given half credit for legal writing in the first year while other schools do not.

The increase will sharpen the distinction between full-time and part-time students. At the present, evening students carry a 10 hour load with one 11 hour semester to make 81. Full-time students, upon completion of their 31 hour first year, are required to carry 20 hours for two semesters and 13 hours for the other two. The report states that the new credit hours “reflects a belief that a 13 hour average minimum in each of the four semesters should be a minimum load.”

The committee hopes that the increase in graduation requirements will be an incentive for more upper-class students to enroll in the “non-traditional” course offerings without the fear of sacrificing minimal coverage of the broader areas of law.

The changes in credit requirements will have a direct impact on the “present practice of accelerated (i.e. seven semester) graduation” for evening students. The long range plan includes a proposal to eventually eliminate that practice. However, the committee reports that the increase to 83 will not necessarily eliminate the accelerated graduation option.” It will require all evening students who participate in the summer session to take a heavier summer load.

Many members of the faculty expressed their concern as to how this increase could be most effectively incorporated into the curriculum. Where the increase will attach, and whether it will be apportioned among the required, elective, or electives courses was questioned left unanswered at the close of the meeting. However, a clear majority agreed that this two-credit hour increase will serve as an initial step toward the substantive enrichment of the curriculum.

The Honorable Charles Fahy (GULC ’14) has been awarded the Georgetown University’s President’s Medal. The medal is rarely awarded, and it is given only to “a person of extraordinary distinction.”

Before Judge Fahy became a circuit judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in 1949, he has served in various positions. He was the first General Counsel of the NLRB, and he has also served as the Solicitor General of the United States, legal advisor to the American occupation in Europe after World War II, legal advisor to the stuberberg trial, legal advisor to the San Francisco conference to draft the charter of the United Nations, and chairman of the President’s Capital City Task Force to Eliminate Racial Discrimination in the Armed Forces of the United States.

As a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Judge Fahy has participated in deciding many of the very legal in cases that have come before the courts during the last generation, and he has written the opinion in many of the cases.

The medal will be presented to Judge Fa- hy at a ceremony to be held on Friday, May 25, in the Hall of Cardinals on the main campus at 4:30 p.m.

CRL offers stipends

The Center For Responsive Law, directed by Ralph Nader, is again offering stipends to students who write their theses or semi- nars papers in selected topics suggested by the organization.

Topics deal with a variety of areas, rang- ing from Food Co-ops, Government Regula- tion, Generic Drugs and Tax Reform. Stipends will be awarded at two levels:

continuing education set

Leahy—

(continued from page 1)

the petition last November.

The finalists will argue before Associate Justice Byron R. White, D.C. Circuit Judge Spotwood W. Robinson, III, and D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals Associate Judge John Ferren in the Leahy Prize Argument, Wednesday night.

The Argument, to be held in the Moot Courtroom, will commence at 8:00 p.m. Seating will be on a first-come, first-seated basis, so students are advised to come early. The Argument will be simulcast by Pete Menenash of the audio-visual department in Hall 6 via closed-circuit television.

A short awards ceremony in which Mr. William E. Leahy will present the Leahy Cup to the advocate achieving the best overall score in the Competition will follow the Argument. Awards will also be presented to the best oral advocate and to the author of the best brief submitted in the Competition.

The Leahy briefs were judged by Associate Dean John Kramer and Professors Michael Seidman and William Greenbahg. All participants who submitted satisfactory briefs received one writing credit for their efforts.

The William E. Leahy Prize Argument is named in memory of a distinguished Law Center graduate and Washington lawyer who represented many prominent political and business figures during the 50's and 60's. " Briefly, he was the Edward Bennett Williams of an earlier generation," Handley told the Law Weekly.

The name of the winner of the Leahy Competition is inscribed on the Roll of Best Advocates on the wall near the Moot Courtroom, and on the Leahy Cup in the Library trophy case.

for the students interested in doing research this summer or are interested in course credits for the fall should submit proposals by May 7. They will be notified no later than May 25. Otherwise, applicants seeking stipends may continue to submit proposals until Oct. 1.

Interested students should contact Prof. for details.

PDP, Kaye
honored

Ralph Nader

Phi Delta Phi, the International Legal Fraternity at the Law Center has been selected as the first student organization of the Scott Inn of Phi Delta Phi to be honored as International Graduate of the Year for 1979 by Province II.

The Court of Appeals of Phi Delta Phi, which is comprised of the Fraternity’s past five international presidents will be making a decision next week on both awards.
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Blackmun on Ryan . . .

"This is the first Annual Thomas Francis Ryan Memorial Lecture. I hope that it will be a success, that it will have the impact and the excitement of the fourth and fifth amendments, which I don't want it to have." 

Blackmun concludes his speech with a saying that was inscribed on a plaque given to Justice Marshall by students at a law school named after him. The plaque said, "If you had not been here, we would not be here." "I certainly hope that as each generation of law students goes forth from this place that there will be at least some among them of whom it may be said later, if they had not been here, others might not be accordingly blessed.

"Obviously, Tom Ryan was one such. The question, I suppose, is whether the rest of us are.

The audience at the Blackmun lecture ranged from Associate Justice John Paul Stevens, the Judge of both the District and Superior Court of D.C., to law professors and law students. The response to the lecture was favorable, and many students in talking with Blackmun after his lecture expressed surprise and pleasure at the sensitivity which they felt Blackmun showed in his lecture.
Guest Opinion

Criticism of Burger fans

By MARK A. deBERNARDO

Chief Justice Warren E. Burger has in creased the public focus of media inquiry in recent months in regards to his com pense as a jurist. The criticism, directed mainly from certain elements of the press and academic communities, recently cul mi nated in Mike Wallace's '60 Minutes' investiga tion aired March 25 and in Robert Sher rill's op-ed article published in the April edition of Playboy.

The criticisms of the Chief Justice in vol ve three avenues, attacking his scholar ship, his character, and his conservatism.

Most common, and perhaps most com peling, is the criticism of Burger's scholar ship. Critics claim that the office of Chief Justice is a job to be in the hands of someone with only a mediocre level of intelligence; scholarship is essential and Burger lacks it.

The second line of criticism attacks Chief Justice Burger's character, claiming he is a boorish rogue who detracts from his office and his colleagues, in behavior and demeanor. Arrogance, pomposity, abusive ness, and paranoia—these flaws add up to an ineffective judicial leader.

The third and final point of attack is Burger's conservatism; the argument of frustration, is that the Chief Justice is an archconservative, out of touch with reality, "stuck in the past" of the Warren Court.

However, by large and these criticisms fail: the Chief Justice's conservatism is a matter of judicial philosophy; attacks on his character or attacks on his intellectual performance or his judgment are not critical. It is not Burger's scholarship, but the attack on his scholarship which are questionable. Burger's critics must prove that his intellectual performance is objective ly, substantially, in error, in order to prove that Burger's scholarship is at least equal to that of other Justices now sitting on the Court or Chief Justices of this century.

Chief Justice Burger has taken it up and its responsibilities, and is less a function of objective critique than of ideological vari ance. Ultimately, it comes down to the question—do you like his philosophy?—privacy and individual rights or the press; do you like his interpretations of prisoners' rights or the public and victims' rights?; effective law enforcement or the privacy of one's home or car from unwarranted intrusion; the death penalty or the sanctity of life.

It is recognized that the press is certainly not a disinterested party in the last 10 years of Supreme Court adjudication. Several Burger Court decisions have put significant limitations on the scope of the juvenile delinquency laws and the pri vacy of the journalist/source relationship. Brandenburg v. Hayes denied a right to refuse to notify before a grand jury. The Stanford Daily case upheld a broad National Park office search warrant, which confused which many would call a police "fishing" expedition. Although pub lic disclosure of Elloinges' leaked Pentagon Papers was not suppressed in New York Times v. United States, the majority let it be known they would suppress publication in certain situations and Chief Justice Burger was not a strong dissenter. The Court refused to decide the shield law case of New York Times reporter Myron Farnes recently bodes poorly for the press and its expectations of a First Amendment cloak of press protection. Beyond the press' dislike for Burger's First Amendment philosophies, there is the curious affair of the Chief Justice's press relations. Some would suggest Burger is paranoid about the press and such infatuated performances as his behavior at his speech at an ABA convention in Atlanta (where the Chief Justice barred reporters from the speech, avoided photographers, and threatened to leave because a cameraman was present as a reception), are manifestations of that paranoia.

However, while it might well be in the Chief Justice's interest to be congenial with journalists and charismatic in his public image, these are irrelevant characteristics to the actual performance of his duties. However complex Burger's responsibilities, it is clear public relations is not one of them, or certainly not one of the important ones.

The "office of Chief Justice is not a public relations job," says Prof. Hutchinson. "I regret the day when it (public relations) becomes part of the job, when in stead of judicial decisions, the job is more like Jerry Falstaff's." As it is, the Chief Justice has no obligation to campaign for popularity, appease the media, or satisfy the most vocal interest groups of the public. Certainly the Constitution doesn't require a Chief Justice to have expansive relations with the press (nor does it require minimal competence—you don't even have to have a law degree.)

However, natty Warren Burger may be to some journalists, and however heeded or ill-advised an exercise this may be, the image is that of the judicial branch nonetheless has no obligation to conduct press conferences. Indeed, to do so may even be a compromise to the Court. "Being head of the judicial branch argues against his holding press conferences," Hutchinson states. "Judges are supposed to speak through their opinions.

Furthermore, Burger's press shyness is not novel; it has been the modus operandi of almost all Supreme Court justices. "None of them give interviews," explains Krafftemaker. "What have we seen—two interviews in the last 10 years, one by Douglas and one by Black. They just don't give interviews." The irony, says Krafft menaker, is that Burger "would be dynamic at p.r. He looks like a Chief Justice, he speaks well, his voice even has just the right ring. "You must look at it in terms of perspective," cautions Hutchinson. "Earl Warren was equally press-shy. He didn't grant interviews and had virtually no relations with the press."

Key to the fact that Earl Warren was philosophically aligned with the press' interest, whereas Burger is a symbol of the Court's lack of sympathy for the press. Ultimately, however, inapplicable Burger's public relations problems, they don't affect his performance as a jurist. "I don't think Burger is any less able than Earl Warren was," declares Hutchinson.

There is also something to be said for the validity of Burger's concern for his own privacy. Similar concern in Warren and Douglas was not construed as press para doxa. Despite the visibility and interest in Burger as a public figure, he does have some right to privacy and deserves to have his freedom as an individual protected.

Perhaps the press is a whole are not as antagonistic to Burger as they were sympa thetic to Warren. Differences in politics again may be the roots of media attack; differing views surface as charges of incompetence.

Loudest and most frequently heard is the cry that Warren Burger lacks scholarship. "The man (Burger) doesn't have serious in tellectual abilities nor does he have serious intellectual potential," claims Krafft menaker. "He's a very nice man and it would be a delight to sit with him at a wine and cheese party, but it would be a disaster to sit with him as a colleague on the bench because it is very difficult to discern how he arrives at his opinions."

Louis Michael Seidman, Georgetown professor and former law clerk to Chief Justice Brennan, also questions Burger's scholarship. "He's certainly not as intelligent as the others (justices)," says Seidman, "and the other justices don't respect him. He hasn't molded the Court despite having the votes to do it, and as a result there's little solidarity."

Asked if the Chief Justice is competent, Prof. Krafftmenaker simply responded, "No," and "The Chief Justice has never been suited to be deputy bureau chief at the I.C.C.," claims Krafftmenaker.

Certainly there are many who would suggest the Chief Justice is not scholarly, but this is not the same as suggesting he is incompetent. Indeed, the value of scholar ship itself can be brought into question; how essential is scholarship, to what extent is it necessary, and how important is it in relationship to other assets vital to a justice's performance?

The counter-arguments to attacks on Burger's lack of scholarship are that he may indeed be scholarly; he may be scholarly enough; or, even if he is not, it is not a fatal flaw. Judgment is what a judge is paid for, not scholarship. But this last line of reasoning, and there are other attributes of good judgment (e.g., experience, common sense, a sense of per cep tual clarity) which are as important or more important than pure scholarship. "Finally, I want a man with good sense and good judgment," said Leon Jaworski, former Watergate special prosecutor, on the 60 Minutes program. "It is unnecessary that a Chief Justice be able to teach at Harvard or write the definitive treatise," says Hutchinson. "What the Court has to do is persuade. Sometimes the most scholarly opinions are not the most persuasive."

Furthermore, some would suggest the extent of the intellectual and theorist approach to problems in this country in the past 15 years has been harmful. A former D.C. prosecutor, now a federal judge, discussing critical philosophy, favored compared Burger's performance on the D.C. Circuit to the performances of David Bazelon and J. Skelly Wright.

(continued on page 5)
New law faculty at Georgetown

Four new full-time faculty members and one visiting professor will be joining the Georgetown University Law Center for 1979-80, Law Dean David J. McCarthy, J.D., announced last week.

The new full-time faculty members include Professor Stephen Cohen, Linda F. Donaldson, Giraudie A. Spam, and Warren F. Schwartz. In making the new faculty announcement, Dean McCarthy also noted that Professor Warren Schwartz comes to the Law Center as a tenured faculty member.

Professor Cohen, a graduate of Amherst College and Yale Law School, was formerly an associate professor of law at the University of Wisconsin Law School. He has also taught as an assistant professor at Rutgers University School of Law and as a visiting professor at Rutgers University School of Law and as a visiting professor at Stanford Law School. He will begin his responsibilities here at Georgetown in the spring of 1980 and will teach Tax II and a seminar.

Professor Donaldson is currently an attorney in the Office of General Counsel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This year she joins the full-time faculty as a professor of Constitutional Law. Previously, she was employed as an attorney with the Public Citizen Litigation Group where she served as the Governor's counsel. Her responsibilities are in the area of voting rights and education law.

Professor Schwartz, formerly a professor of law at the University of Virginia School of Law, received his B.A. in 1961 and his LL.B. in 1964 from the University of Virginia, where he was editor-in-chief of the Virginia Law Review. He has also been a professor at the University of Chicago and a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley. He will teach Property and Antitrust Law at the Law Center.

Professor Spam spanishes his academic career at the University of California at Berkeley, where he was a member of the faculty and the Assistant Dean of the Law School. He will be teaching Federal Courts & Federal System and Contracts at the Law Center.

He returned to school at the University of Minnesota, earned his B.A. in political science, and joined the U.S. Army, entering active service as a commissioned officer in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. He was commissioned as a lieutenant in the 40th Field Artillery Regiment and served as an attorney in the Judge Advocate General's Corps. He was commissioned as a lieutenant in the 40th Field Artillery Regiment and served as an attorney in the Judge Advocate General's Corps.

At the time of this writing, the three new full-time faculty members are being evaluated and will be assigned to their respective faculties.
Harder line urged for South Africa

By AMANDA SEWARD

United States foreign policy towards southern Africa was described as "high flown rhetoric" at a recent Law Center panel discussion.

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Robert Kelley defended the administration’s position. He said there was only so much the United States could do and that a great deal of time was being spent on trying to find answers for the troubled areas of southern Africa including the countries of Namibia, Zimbabwe Rhodesia, as the new nation will be called, and South Africa. He estimated that southern Africa is the nation’s third major foreign policy concern after SALT and the Middle East.

Kelley represented the State Department in the Law Center discussion entitled, "United States Southern African Policy during the Carter Administration," held April 17. Several southern Africa experts responded to Kelley’s presentation, including Theo-Ben Gurirab, observer in the United Nations for the Southwest African Peoples’ Organization (SWAPO) of Namibia; Chester Crocker, director of African Studies for the Georgetown University Center for Strategic and International Studies; Randall Robinson, executive director of a lobby group called TransAfrica; and Theodore Lockwood, director of the Washington Office on Africa, a group of foreign policy analysts who do research and writing on southern African issues. Law Center professor Don Wallace, Jr., who directs the Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law, moderated the discussion.

It was difficult to determine just what American policy is toward southern Africa, Kelley said that the United States would avoid policies that show South Africa’s whites that the United States is opposed to them as distinct from their policies, and at the same time, "avoid policies that give the impression that we accept apartheid." Robinson complained that the United States had not gone far enough and that African leaders were disappointed in the policy. He urged that U.S. policy towards South Africa be seen in terms of 1.8 billion dollars in U.S. investment in South Africa, 2.2 billion dollars in loans, and more than 2 billion dollars in two-way trade. He said, "If the United States supports majority rule it has to take those hard steps to make that happen." He pointed out that American arms still flow from South Africa to Rhodesia despite the United Nations’ mandatory arms embargo against Rhodesia. He also said that without oil from the United States, Britain, and France, the apartheid system could not survive.

Kelley answered him saying that the United States had supported the arms embargo against Rhodesia and had gone further by discontinuing all exports to that country. But he admitted that the embargo against Rhodesia was ineffective as long as South Africa was willing to trade with Rhodesia. He said that the American people had not shown their support for an embargo against South Africa and further, it would also need the support of the nation’s allies.

Robinson reiterated his point: there was more the United States could do. For example, he said, 1,000 American mercenaries are fighting in Rhodesia, and they were openly recruited in a church in Chicago. The administration had made no proposal to endorse laws that would eliminate such practices.

He further suggested that there was racism in the approach the government had taken in addressing the South African situation. He said that when Congress banned trade valued at 250,000 dollars with U.S. Amin’s Uganda, no one had any problems with it. "If a ban on trade is an appropriate response to Uganda, is it not just as appropriate to what’s going on in South Africa? Were blacks repressing whites as whites are blacks, we wouldn’t see the investments, the loans or the trade."

Crocker argued that public indifference to what was going on in southern Africa was encouraged by the administration to discourage active discussion. He predicted that 95% of the American public was unaware of what continent Namibia is on.

Lockwood called on the President to explain to the American people the important issues in southern Africa so that the public would take more of an interest and become aware of its importance.

A brief question and answer period followed the presentations, including an exchange involving the recent elections being held under Rhodesia’s new constitution approved earlier this year by that nation’s whites. It is referred to as the “internal plan” and sets up a black majority Parliament to rule for five years. This plan has been criticized because whites would control the judiciary, civil service, Army and police.

Highlights of the question and answer period follow.

Q: What is your stand on the recent elections in Rhodesia and the attempt to send U.S. observers?

A: Robinson: The Administration supported us on this one. Even the Johannesburg Star has said that this constitution can represent no significant transfer of power to blacks. Any election that arises from that constitution is inherently unfair and unfair. You don’t need to send American observers over there to make that dem
SITTING ON the panel were Randall Robinson (left), Robert Keeley, Donald Wallace, Ted Lockwood, Chester Crocker and Theoben Gurirab.

mation. It can be made now. Obviously Ian Smith wanted the observers over there to authenticate the whole process and himself. We thought that it would be a serious mistake for the United States to make. Smith can't be allowed to choose his own method of transition. It would be as if a criminal were allowed to choose his own judge, jury and venue. It doesn't make sense.

Keeley: The disadvantage of sending observers would be that it would be interpreted in most of Africa as blessing the internal settlement. Fortunately for us, Congress did not send observers.

Q. What effect would economic sanctions against South Africa have on the United States?

A. Keeley: It would not be a major factor in terms of our international trade, but it would be a major factor for Britain, somewhat less for France and Germany, but in any case, more in those countries than for us. Our trade is so large that no one country could affect that much but it would have some effect.

Robinson: One would like to think that this country, if it wanted to be true to any of its principles, would not want to enjoy that kind of advantage at the enormous expense of the freedom of 18 million South Africans.

Q. What is the status of South Africa's nuclear development?

A. Crocker: There is the potential for South Africa to be a major nuclear power — many people speculate that it already is. My guess is that they are, within six months, if they choose to be.

Q. What effect will economic sanctions have on South Africa?

A. Robinson: 70% of South Africa's computers are from the United States. The remaining 30% are from Britain. Without them South Africa could not issue payroll checks. Also 40% of South Africa's crude oil is from the United States. Oil is vital to the South African economy.

Q. If the United Nations voted sanctions would the U.S. respect them?

A. Keeley: The executive branch certainly would, we are required to by our international obligations. But Congress might not. The Byrd Amendment overrode the international sanctions against Rhodesia. The same thing could happen again. I suppose the Executive would oppose it since it worked hard to repeal the Byrd Amendment and did so successfully in 1977.

Q. If Nigeria were to stop exporting oil to South Africa, would it have an effect on South Africa's economy?

A. Robinson: Yes, it might be more effective than moral suasion, but, it's a difficult decision for Nigeria to make.

But African countries have done that quite courageously. In southern Africa one of the countries that has paid the highest price for its principles is Zambia. Over the last 13 years, Zambia has suffered tremendously in human terms as well as economic terms. There is some indication that Mozambique has lost more people in the Rhodesian war than they did in their own war for liberation. So that there is a commitment on the part of many African countries to pay this price for its principles. Whether Nigeria chooses to do that remains to be seen. But you're talking about countries with tremendous development needs.

Q. No one has said anything about Russia. What part does Russia play in southern Africa and what is the United States' stand on Russian involvement?

A. Keeley: We certainly are concerned with Soviet and Cuban involvement in Africa. We have tried to look at Africa somewhat less in East-West terms than the prior administration did. Generally, the Soviets and the Cubans have been invited in. How do you keep them out? You keep them out by solving the problems that those governments have before they reach the point that they need outside help. That's our approach.

Robinson: If there is a Soviet advantage taken in Africa, the United States and the Western powers have largely themselves to thank for it. There has not been an African liberation leader that has not asked the United States for assistance. There's no appreciation here of the great suffering that people are enduring in southern Africa. The people there have made a commitment that it is better to risk one's life than to live like this. They're prepared to accept arms from those willing to provide them and to deem those that do, as friends.

Gurirab: It's important that I comment on this one because we are largely responsible for bringing the Russians and Cubans in southern Africa. In every instance where the Russians are involved, they were invited. They did not come in through the back door or other surreptitious means as the CIA is fond of doing. Ever since we started to wage our struggle for liberation against those white races in southern Africa, we came first — because of the historical connection — to Western countries. We were told it was not possible because they were against violence. Yet at the same time, through all kinds of ways, USA-made, French-made, British-made, German-made, Canadian-made, and Belgian-made weapons found their way to Pretoria and Salisbury. In any case Russians are really not all that bad. During World War II they were your allies to fight Nazism. We are now in our hour of need.
After 190 years Georgetown University students will have a “real” recreation facility. According to the Director of Athletics, Francis Rienzo, the Yates Field House will officially open in mid-July.

The $7.5 million complex was approved by the Georgetown graduate and undergraduate student body - including medical, dental and Law Center students - in a 1976 referendum during which they agreed to a mandatory $30/semester fee.

At the time of the referendum there was great concern about the accessibility of the complex for the Law Center student body. Noting this concern, Mr. Rienzo indicated that the University is taking special care to help Law Center students obtain maximum benefit from the new facility. "We're studying programs to institute GUTS bus service between Yates and the Law Center and the Roosyl Metro station," he said.

"In addition, Law Center students with current parking decals will be able to park in the New South parking lot of the campus and there is no charge after 7 p.m., for those without stickers.

The facility is clearly accessible from 295 to Independence Avenue, to Whitehurst, to Canal Road, and should be convenient for students with bicycles. The transportation survey (included in this issue) is designed to help us determine probable Law Center student usage so that we can best make transportation provisions," Rienzo added.

The Yates Field House will enable Georgetown to finally offer its students an exceptional recreational facility. The complex will offer: indoor tennis, squash (4 courts), racquetball/handball (4 courts), swimming (6 meters, eight lane pool and separate diving pool), outdoor sun deck, volleyball, basketball, badminton, 200 meter indoor jogging track, dance exercise room, 2000 new lockers, lounge and concessions area for men's and women's use.

Yates is expected to become a social and recreational center for the entire University community. Students who have previously felt that Georgetown frustrated any physical activity urge, will find expanded intramural programs and individual workout opportunities on the universal gym or in the swimming pool. With the exception of swimming, no varsity level sporting events are planned. However, even during practice a portion will be available for recreational swimming.

Part time students - and this category includes evening Law Center students - will have the option of joining the center at the $30/semester fee. Faculty/staff and Alumni of the University will also have the opportunity to join at fees somewhat higher than those of students. Fees are expected to range from $120/year for single faculty/staff with appropriate family membership fees.

Designed by the architectural firm of Daniel F. Tully Associates, the Yates Field House contains the largest concrete hyperbolic parabola ever constructed. Its underground design makes it possible to conserve energy by maintaining a uniform temperature throughout the facility year round.

Kehoe football field, which has been torn up for construction of the new building, will be reconstituted on the roof of the new building with a natural turf surface and synthetic 400 meter all weather track in time for the Fall season.

Brochures detailing the new Yates Field House further will be sent to all students during the summer.

Committee clarifies work rule

The Academic Honesty Committee is concerned by instances which have recently come to its attention involving the question of whether a student commits an act of academic dishonesty when he permits the same written work in two courses, seminars or programs.

The rule states: "A student shall not offer for credit in any course, seminar or program, in satisfaction of a requirement of written work by the student, any work prepared for any other purpose (such as work submitted in another course or seminar), work prepared for a law firm or government agency, work prepared with the written permission of each member of the faculty involved in such course, seminar or program obtained upon full disclosure to such faculty member."

The rules concerning academic honesty appear in "Responsibilities of Students," Administrative and Academic Regulations, 18-31 (Aug. 1978) and above rule is paragraph 31). Copies of those rules are available at the registrar's desk. The Committee urges students to read those rules so as to avoid any problems of academic honesty.

Yates Field House

$7.5 Million Rex-Plex to open in July

CULTURE CALENDAR

DANCE

Fairfax Ballet, Lister at Noon, April 24, 12:15 p.m. FREE

Dance Showcase, Modern Dance Council, Washington Project for the Arts, April 27-28, 8 p.m.; April 28, 5 p.m. (Info: 347-8204)

10 Days of Dance," Dance Exchange, films, performances, free classes, through April 29 (Info: 797-7029)

Arlington Dance Theatre, Thomas Jefferson Community Theatre, April 27-28, 8 p.m.; April 29, 3 p.m. (Info: 684-8000)

Virginia Ballet in Repertory, Lister, GWU, April 28, 8 p.m.

Round House Mime Troupe, Gaston Hall, G.U., April 29, 8 p.m. (Info: 626-3315)

St. Mark Dance Co., lunch concert, new choreography performed by junior company, March 29, 11:30-1:30

City Dance '79, WPAS, 10 local companies, Warner Theater, May 3-5, 8 p.m.

Annual Staff Concert, Dance Project, May 12-13, 8; May 13, 5 p.m. (Info: 462-1321)

ART

"John Melchion, still-life color photographs, Corcoran, April 25-June 17

"David Hockney: Travels with Pen, Pencil, and Ink," Hirshhorn, through June 10

"Paint and Drawings by the Carracci Family," National Gallery, West Building, through May 20

"Mexico," Capital Children's Museum (800 - 3rd St. N.W.), Sat., through May 14 (Info: 544-2244)

Films: "Paul Klee," April 24, 26, 28; "Wassily Kandinsky," "The Expressionist Revolt," April 25, 27, East Wing Auditorium, 12:30 & 6 p.m. FREE

Lecture: "Cezanne and America," John Rewald, 1979 Mellon Lecture, National Gallery, East Wing, Sundays through May 27, 4 p.m. FREE

THEATRE

American College Theatre Festival, Kennedy Center, Terrace Theatre, through May 6; FREE Performing Arts Symposium with author, director and cast of "And They Dance Real Slow in Jackson," Hanover College, April 25, 12 noon, Terrace Theatre

Don Juan," Arena, through May 6

"Treible and Her Demons," by Isaac Bashevis Singer and Eve Friedman, ironic story of demonic seductions and mystical faith in 19th century Poland, Arena, through June 3 "Idiot's Delight," Robert Sherwood's comedic romance, Arena, May 18-June 24


Midday Musa, Folger Library, poetry readings, Thursdays through May 3, 12:15 p.m. FREE

Leone Ullman, Yale Young Poet, Folger Library, May 29, 8 p.m.

Ann Farr, "Dissident Baldwin," Performance Poetry Reading, Washington Project for the Arts, April 30, 8 p.m.

MUSIC

GWU Orchestra Concert, Lister, April 23, 8:30 p.m. FREE

National Symphony Orchestra, Leonard Bernstein, conducting, Kennedy Center, Concert Hall, April 24-25, 27, 8:30 p.m.

Washington Opera, "I Capuletti Ed I Montecchi," April 24, 27, 29; "Don Pasquale," April 26-28, Kennedy Center, Opera House, 8 p.m.

Luso-Brasillian Club Concert, Gaston Hall, G.U., April 24, 8 p.m. (Info: 625-4815)

G.U. Midday Arts Series, Ed Walker, organ recital, Dahlgren Chapel, April 25, 1 p.m. (Info: 625-3315)
LAW CENTER TRANSPORTATION SURVEY FOR YATES FIELD HOUSE

The University wishes to provide maximum service for law students to the main campus Yates Field House. In an effort to improve transportation service for Georgetown Law students to the main campus Yates Field House, please fill out the following transportation survey. The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide information and opinions essential to the study. Names are not required and individual responses are completely confidential. Return the completed questionnaire to the Athletic department representative in the Kiosk today or drop them off in room 473.

1. Did you read the article in the LAW WEEKLY about the Yates Field House?
   Yes__ No___

2. What is your affiliation with the Law Center? (check one)
   Faculty___
   Staff___
   Visitor___
   Student___
   a. day___
   b. night___
   c. year___

3. Do you have access to a car which you drive in the Washington Metropolitan Area?
   No__ Yes, most of the time__ Yes, occasionally___

4. Please indicate the zip code of your residence and workplace.
   a. Residence, (if not known, give general address)___
   b. Workplace___

5. Of all trips you generally make to and from the Law Center during the week, approximately what percentage are made by each of the following modes? (columns should add to 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Percentage of Trips to GULC</th>
<th>Percentage of Trips from GULC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Drive a motor vehicle and park at or around GULC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ride as an auto passenger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(number of persons in the car)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Metrorail/Metrobus Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(routes # _______ )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro/GUTS Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to GULC from GULC

d. Taxi___
e. Bicycle, motorcycle, moped___
f. Walk___

6. Based on your current schedule, please indicate the following information on the chart below:
   1) Usual arrival time at the Law Center (use an "A")
   2) Usual departure time from the Law Center (use a "D")
   3) The hours you would use the Yates Field House if it were now open (use an "O")
   4) Mark in the appropriate column from where you would be leaving when coming to the Yates Field House and to where you would be returning afterwards: H = Home; W = Work; GULC = Law Center

7. How often do you use GUTS?
   a. 4 or more times per week___
   b. 2 or 3 times per week___
   c. 2 to 4 times per month___
   d. rarely or never___

8. If you rarely or never use GUTS, what is the reason?
   a. too slow___
   b. doesn’t go where I need to go___
   c. not available when I need it___
   d. too infrequent___
   e. other, please specify___

9. If the GUTS service were expanded to include more timely and proximate service from the Law Center or the Yates Field House to your Home would you use it?
   a. yes___ b. no___

10. Additional comments, suggestions___

THE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT IS SHOWING A SLIDE PRESENTATION OF THE NEW YATES FIELD HOUSE IN THE KIOSK TODAY DROP QUESTIONNAIRES OFF THERE OR IN ROOM 473
Dear Coz:
The last time you wrote me you asked me to tell you something about some of the events at the law school. As you so aptly put it, things happening around an institution like ours are often too complicated for the uninstructed to understand. True, coz. But let me tell you dear coz, even some of us who are somewhere between the initiated and the uninstructed do not always understand events around here.
For example, not too long ago the Law Weekly reported that there were reasons to believe that some irregularities had taken place during a journal write-on competition. Soon after that, the Dean appointed an ad hoc committee to inquire into the situation and report back to him. Well, dear coz, the report of the committee is out. The committee has concluded that, although it was "unable to say that the reported incidents absolutely (and note that word, dear coz) could not have happened, the facts presented to us and the manner of their presentation allow us to give them no greater substantiation than that accorded any rumor."
So far, so good.
As a matter of fact, the report is very good, for the most part. However, two items in the report need further explanation. There was a suggestion that an alternative code be used instead of the social security number to improve the system of blind grading. Because the allegation was made that the social security number of one of the competitors was given to an insider who made sure that the paper with that particular number was assigned to him or her to be graded with the desired result, I don't see how using a different coding system would be an improvement on the current system, as long as the code is available to a write-on competitor and an insider who are both determined to cheat.
The committee also recommended to the faculty to seriously "consider the creation of yet another journal or some other outlet for sustained scholarly writing... Creation of a new journal or similar writing experience would not only accomplish important pedagogical goals, but more importantly -- and pertinent to this report -- it might reduce the pressure to cheat by providing the journal experience to more students." Really, that's what the committee said.
Personally, I am all for the "pedagogical" argument for creating another journal, but the "pressure reduction" argument raises some questions in my mind. How do we "reduce the pressure" on the students who cheat in exams? How do we "reduce the pressure" on the turkeys who ruin our articles in the library? How do we "reduce the pressure" on those who cheat in other situations? Or, perhaps more appropriately, does this institution have a duty to "reduce the pressure" on such students? I don't know, coz. But I don't feel comfortable with that argument as a basis for creating another journal.
If you ask me, I'll tell you that because of the number of students in this institution the diversity in their backgrounds, and the competence of our faculty, we should seriously consider the creation of another journal.
Well, coz, that's all for now. I'll be back in touch next August.
Not planning our road to doomsday

BY JAYADE CHAUDHRI

With each gas-guzzling automobile rolling off the assembly line in Detroit, with each new subway without mass-transit and with each bottle bearing the legend "No Deposit - No Return," we draw nearer to the fate that so many so-called "doomsday prophets" have long predicted — a dramatic change in the way of life as we know it today.

In our society where present consumption is the rule, and the California dream "Now" generation philosophy reigns supreme, the hope of a long-term stable and decent standard of living with every Jaucuzi and junkyard. We go on rapidly depleting our non-renewable natural resources at a rate which may well mean that there will be none left within our lifetime. Incredibly as it may seem, it is likely to come to pass.

While many a self-serving industrialist ("more profits now") will jump on his soap-box and rant about the alarmist excesses of ecological evangelists, there is no getting away from the fact that the earth's resources are, indeed, finite. The estimates of supply and demand for the efficiency of use of the resources may vary, but there is little chance that the world's minerals, forests and oil will last into the twenty-second century. It is a sobering experience to look at the figures for world supplies and demand for various natural resources and commodities. In the long run we are all dead, and the long run may not be that long.

In the light of this harsh reality, why is it that there has been no serious long-term planning to conserve our resources? Ultimately of course, we are all responsible, but the generations of spineless politicians, too concerned with reelection, must bear the brunt of the blame. Unwilling to confront the realities of conservative consumption, the powers that be hide behind everything from face-lifts babies and incompetence to the invoking of these words - recession, depression, American jobs.

The whole energy problem is typical of the ineptitude and moral bankruptcy of the Congress, and its refusal to deal with reality. Energy Secretary Arthur Schlesinger was invited to resign recently when he told a Congressional hearing that unless energy consumption decreased very soon, there would be a drastic change in the way of life, as we know it. Unfortunately, he is right, and all the self-righteous pomposity of self-serving Congressmen is only going to hasten that day.

Crucial long-term planning is non-existent because today's leaders are unwilling to take any action that will not have an immediate positive effect on their constituents. Such myopia leads to politicians being unable to consider anything more than a few years away, and so most real problems go unsolved except in a superficial band-aid sort of a fashion.

Since any viable energy program, for example, will inevitably have adverse short-term effects, we may never get an energy program because too many politicians, elected and supported by special interest groups, as they are, are reluctant to risk the political fallout of these short-term adjustments.

So we go on consuming more and more, and as we deplete domestic resources, we keep importing more and more. For a long time now The United States has maintained and improved its standard of living by consuming the lion's share of the world's resources. We have consumed more and more and at the expense, both in the short run and the long run, of the poor of the world. This immorality of consuming the whole world's resources in exchange for luxury exports like "I Love Lucy" and "Kojak" reruns and bubble gum is compounded when you consider the concomitant exploitation of the poorer countries' labor force and wanton environmental degradation. The privilege of driving fancy automobiles here is not unrelated to the starving souls in deforested, fuel-less sub-Saharan Africa.

In any case, as the developing Third World countries begin to awaken to the realities of the importance of non-renewable natural resources, and their use as political and economic weapons, the United States may soon not be able to buy what it wants at will. The OPEC oil cartel has demonstrated what may soon happen to many minerals and also commodities such as coffee, tea and cocoa.

Then will our reckless, unplanned conspicuous consumpition of decades past, that our leaders never moderated in any kind of a conservation ethic, come to haunt us. Every unrecycled bottle and newspaper, every tank of gasoline wasted away and every polluted water body will mean that there will be that much less to use then.

The only other long-term solution remains the hope of technology — the hope of new frontiers, more efficient machines, higher yield crops, a cleaner environment, new and cheap forms of energy and less waste. Here too, our hopes are diminished. The commitment to long-term funding of research and development, although greater in the sixties, with the Space Race as the beacon, has seen large cut-backs in funding in the last ten years. During the Nixon administration, there were massive cut-backs in the funding of both pure and applied science research. Many important research programs were severely curtailed.

The present administration, with its credit, has tried to increase support of research and development, but not nearly enough. The statistics show that a far greater fraction of the Gross National Product of countries like West Germany, Japan and Great Britain is spent on research than in the United States. This may be one reason why the United States is no longer competitive in many areas of international trade.

If we in this country hope, in the long run, to maintain our way of life, or something approaching it, and be the force that we ought to be (that we have not really been), then it is high time that our leaders give thought to long-term planning and make a commitment to solving problems whose solutions may not be realized in a hundred years. So bring on solar energy, fusion, full-scale recycling, mass-transit and ban the private automobile from the inner city. Now.

GULC, Argentina to exchange professors

An exchange program between the Law Center and the Faculty of Law at the University of Rosario, Argentina will be initiated by the Institute for International and Foreign Trade Law in June. Participating scholars will be specialists in the legal aspects of international business law. The exchange of scholars is planned as a three year program involving professors who are noted experts on the various aspects of national, regional, and international commercial law. The faculty exchange was developed through the combined efforts of former Visiting Professor Juan Dobson and the Institute's Assistant Director for Research and Administration, George Spina.

The selection of participants will be made by their respective universities. Professor John Steadman of the Law Center has been selected as the first GULC participant in this program. His visit to the Argentine university will last the first part of August 1979. Professor Steadman, who is soon to be Associate Dean of the Law Center, has taught such courses as Constitutional Law, State and Local Government Law, and Commercial Law, and has served as counsel to the Department of Justice, and as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

The first Argentine scholar to participate in the exchange will be Professor Juan Dobson of the University of Rosario. Professor Dobson, who served as the Institute's Visiting Scholar in Fall 1978, will return the favor in April 1980.

Professor Dobson is currently Academic Secretary of the Law Faculty at the University of Rosario, and has held several university teaching posts in Argentina. His legal specialties include Business Law, Bankruptcies, Negotiable Instruments and Banking Contracts.

The professors will conduct a program consisting of seminars, discussion groups, panels, and lectures which will be open to students, faculty, and members of the bar and the business community. As Dean McCarthy has noted, "with the exchange of two such outstanding individuals, our exchange will be off to an excellent beginning!"

#79 THE EXAM TAKERS HANDBOOK. $79
MADE TO ORDER THE PROPER COURSE MATERIAL NO LATER THAN 4 WEEKS BEFORE EXAM DATE.
EXAMPLES:
A. B. C. D.
WRONG. WRONG. BARELY ACCEPTABLE. GUARANTEED
Res Perponds

From the Registrar
Exams
Forms for smoking and typing during the exams, and for proctoring assignments are available at the Registrar's Office. Exam numbers will be mailed shortly. Be certain we have your proper local address.

Fall registration results
Fall registration results and information on add/drop will be available at the end of the month. Please watch bulletin boards for further information.

May graduates
Absolutely last chance to apply for graduation this May and to complete forms necessary to have a diploma engraved in time for the ceremony.

Due dates for papers
Seminar and Graduate papers for those graduating in May must be submitted between May 7th and 11th. All others may submit their papers between May 7-18th. Submit papers during normal business hours to the Registrar's Office and obtain a receipt.

Suggestion box
We have installed a suggestion box near our fourth floor counter. Let us hear from you. Every suggestion or complaint will receive consideration and a reply will be posted.

Best wishes
Good luck to everyone on the exams.

From the SBA
Committee positions
Notice to the student body. The SBA is now seeking to fill various positions in the following student committees:
Academic Honesty and Appeals — Four student members
Financial Aid — Four student members
Admissions — Five student members

Burger
(continued from page 5)
again this is a question of philosophies and does not address the issues of scholarship.

"Certainly there is reason to believe Burger is not the most brilliant literary figure that's ever sat on the Court, or by any means the most liberal," says Professor Murphy, his former law clerk, "but in areas of the sanity rule, the exclusionary rule, or the Fourth Amendment in general, areas he's consistently fought liberal reading of, you can't fault his scholarship."

Regardless of one's politics, Chief Justice Burger deserves better. Burger cannot be judged on human imperfections and personal foibles. Nor should he be attacked personally for matters of judicial philosophy. He must be judged on his ability as Chief Justice. Certainly he is not a Cardozo or Learned Hand, but that is no crime. Only two have been.

By less lofty standards, however, Chief Justice Burger has been a capable Chief Justice: certainly not brilliant, but just as certainly not incompetent. The Court, as an institution, has not suffered in his hands and under his direction, and as judge and man, Warren Burger retains his dignity.

THE HAWAIIAN community at GULC and on the Senate staff enjoy a luau complete with roast pig.

All must be third-year or fourth-year evening students.
Applications can be picked up in the Student Activities Office and must be returned by Tuesday, May 1, to either the SBA Office or Student Activities Office.

Graduation tickets
Students graduating May 1979 can pick up their packet of invitations and instructions in the Student Activities Office starting Tuesday, April 24, between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m.

Speakers board
The Student Bar Association is soliciting students interested in serving on a newly created student committee Speaker's Board. This new committee will bring speakers to the Law Center. There are fifteen openings and you must be here during the summer since the committee will be meeting. All interested students should pick up an application at the Student Activities Office. Further information will be provided then.

Student Activities
Women's film festival
An International Women's Film Festival will be shown Friday and Saturday nights as a special study break sponsored by the Women's Rights Collective, La Alliance, Asian Law Students and the National Lawyers' Guild. The films will be "Lucia," "Blow by Blow," "Sandukan," "Antonia," and "Cuban Women." Time and place will be announced later by posters.

The Property Rights Clinic is an advocacy clinic. The Law Weekly incorrectly reported that the clinic was a non-advocacy clinic.

Correction

CLINIC POSITIONS AVAILABLE: There are four positions open for the Juvenile Justice Clinic for the 1979-80 school year. Ten credits for the entire year. If interested, call Bev at 624-8205 between 9 and 5.

Georgetown Med student looking for grad or law students interested in sharing a house near main campus (G.U.) for next academic year (1979-80). If interested, please call Steve at 337-0924 (evenings).

Blowing it off
Friday, May 18th, from 5 p.m. to whenever, there will be a last day of exams party featuring lots of food, music, and booze. Rock'n'roll starts it off with Joey Smyada & the Gloryholes making their first appearance since their parole was revoked after the talent show. Then at 8 p.m., the tempo changes and "D.J." Stone will spin the discs and share the spotlight with a live SALSA band to keep your feet movin' all night long. Lots of free beer, wine, punch, munchies, and real food for a buffet-style dinner will be provided. So whatever kind of a dancing fool you are, there's something for you. Don't miss this chance to celebrate the end of the year, say goodbye to old friends and meet new ones!

From the Library
Library work
The Library needs law students, preferably work-study, to work in Circulation, Shelving, and Reference for the duration of the semester. There is a possibility of full-time work during the summer. $3.50 per hour. See Barbara Taylor, Room 215B, the Library, to apply.

ID card checks
In an effort to assure seating for Georgetown students in the Law Library during the upcoming high use period for exam study, all patrons are asked to show their GU or personal identification upon entrance to the Law Library through May 18. Only authorized patrons and GU students will be admitted into the Law Library during this period. Direct all inquiries to Frank Herch, ext. 8275.

Et alia
Tutorial positions
Students interested in applying for a position as a tutorial workshop leader, special subject or writing tutor for the 1979-80 academic year, should leave a resume with Ms. Mary Telesford in the Dean's Office Room 404.

Securities conference
A Congressional Securities Conference will be sponsored by the Georgetown University Law Center and the FBA Securities Law Committee June 14-17 at the Bedford Springs Hotel in Bedford, Pa. The conference will explore issues in securities regulations which are of current legislative significance. Those interested should register by April 27. For more information call Ms. Leslie A. Brown at 624-8229.

Georgetown Law Weekly
600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

MOVING SALE: Big apartment sale. Chair, dinette set, sofa, large table ranging in price from only $30 to $75. 10-speed Murray bicycle for only $40. Special on snow tires, $7.50-14. on wheels, only $40. Call 765-7383 before 9 p.m.