Trial Balloons

By Bruce Thomas

Getting a jump on the final budget mark-up meeting, Professor Charles Abernathy revealed a number of proposals in last Friday's Finance Committee meeting. He plans to make these proposals in the all day budget mark-up session at the end of this semester. Foremost among these was a proposal to force the Clinic Committee to undertake a review of a clinic personnel allocation. This is taken with a view of cutting back certain clinics to adjust for the lessening of student demand.

Such a review for fiscal year 1983 was offered last week by Clinic Committee Chairman Professor John Kramer. Abernathy said that he could see no reason in waiting a year to begin the review, particularly since Kramer "pretty much told us that student enrollment [in clinics] will drop next year, too."

The proposal was enthusiastically supported by student members Jim Tapper and Pat Merkle. Merkle stated that the proposal "is going to fail."

There was some question in the committee about whether it would be possible to cut clinics this year. Assistant Dean for Administration, Denis Ransmeier stated, "The only place you can cut is Fellows." Fellows presently have contracts which may not be terminable. "That's why I'm floating the proposal now," Abernathy said.

Abernathy suggested that it may be possible to shift some fellows to the clinics which presently have the most student demand. The professor also stated, "I'm planning on giving the clinics even less than an increase."

Professor Barry Carter, while noting that he was not in favor of an absolute cut in the clinic budget, noted that the Finance Committee is presently faced with the choice of improving an increase or cutting a full clinic. Carter stated that there ought to be some alternative. Abernathy also emphasized that he too was in favor of saving all the clinics, particularly the Sex Discrimination Clinic.

Other Proposals

Other Abernathy proposals included a deferred payment plan for tuition. He suggested some type of mandatory loan that would "build up a feeling of (See Trial, page 6)

Organizations Grounded

Student Funds shall not be directly or indirectly spent to pay for travel by students.

Yes 480 No 302

In emergency situations, this policy may be overridden for an individual expenditure by a ⅔ majority vote of the House of Delegates.

Yes 456 No 253

By Lisa Betancourt

The long-awaited and highly publicized Travel Referendum was finally held on November 18th and 19th. The results, which are binding on the Student Bar Association, mandate that SBA monies will no longer be used to fund student travel to national conferences and other such events. In a related provision the Referendum provides for "emergency" funding through a ⅔ vote of the House of Delegates.

The issue of funding student travel has long been in controversy, and was believed to be resolved on September 16th of this year, when the House of Delegates instituted a new Travel Policy. That Policy dictated that all student organizations requesting funds for travel must include such requests in their yearly budget proposals, Thus, (See Referendum, page 2)

Hard Day's Night

Night Students Complain of Raw Deal

By Nancy Rooney

The targets were the same: the Placement Office, course scheduling, the law clubs, the library, parking, and yes, even the Law Weekly.

The complaints, however, are different—as different as, well, night and day. In recent interviews, several evening students spoke about the problems of the often-forgotten night division experiences at Georgetown. Two broad complaints underlie the evening students' more specific criticisms. First, the night students contend that they are short-changed in the school's resource distribution between the day and night divisions. Secondly, the students feel that the school lacks a clear understanding of who they are and of how their needs differ from the day students. The general refrain on money matters, echoed over and over again, was "we pay tuition, just like the day students, why can't we have more services?"

"We are especially the money-makers for the school," explained Peggy Stone, the SBA vice-
By Duane Boggs

Full term finals, followed by the holidays, and it's suddenly time to think about financial aid, loan eligibility, and paying for GULC 1982-83. When the Finance Committee announces our all-new, improved, giant economy-sized tuition on December 4, this will all become even more relevant.

According to Ruth Lammett-Reeves, Financial Aid Director, in December her office will mail a GAPSFAS to the local address of each returning student who filed one last year. If a student does not receive it before the end of the exam period, one can be picked up at the Financial Aid Office. Any student who did not file a GAPSFAS last year but wants to this year may also pick one up. A GAPSFAS can not be completed until the appropriate 1981 Income Tax Return is ready to be filed but should be in to the Princeton office by February 10.

If a student meets the first two tests of self-support (1. receiving less than $1000 in money or kind from parents; 2. living less than six weeks at the student's home), he might consider advising the parents NOT to claim the student as a dependent for 1981 (regardless of advice from a tax consultant). Depending on tax bracket, the extra deduction might save the parents from $300 to $1000 in tax but would also cost the student her/his eligibility for a $5000 Guaranteed Student Loan. Unclaimed supporters would be eligible for the full $5000 unless they earned more than $30,000 in 1981. If a student does not meet any one test of self-support, then parents' Adjusted Gross Income will determine eligibility. Again, $30,000 is the turning point. If parents' AGI is below this, the full $5000 is available. If AGI is over, need must be proven.

Congress, the Department of Education and David Stockman's Office of Management and the Budget have not yet decided how this need will be measured. According to Lammett-Reeves, there are approximately eight proposals floating around and Congress might not consider and choose until as late as March. If no agreement can be reached and lending institutions and financial aid officers have to make decisions, the status quo might be continued. Otherwise, here are some of the options being considered:
1. Lower the cap on aggregate educational loans from $25,000 to $15,000. If a GULC student had no undergraduate loans, he would remain eligible for up to $5000 per year for three years. With undergraduate loans of $6900 ($1,500 per year for four years), the student would only be eligible for an additional $9,000 distributed as needed over the three years of law school.
2. No loan eligibility for any student whose parents' AGI is over $50,000 regardless of any tests of need.
3. All GSLAs based on need regardless of income. Presumably need would be based on the GAPSFAS or some similar form.
4. Increase the loan origination fee from 5% to 10%. A $5000 loan would then set the student only $4,500 to apply to tuition.
5. No postponement of interest payments until after graduation. On a $5000 loan at 9% per annum, the student would pay $37.50 per month during the first year in school. During the third year, when a $15,000 debt would have been stacked up, this would amount to $112.50/month. Upon graduation, interest payments would continue but payments on principal would also begin.
6. Add the interest that accrues during school to the principal for repayment after graduation. Thus, borrowing $5000 would cost $4750 (at 9% origination fee) and, after one year's interest (at 9%, that's $450) was added, the student would owe $5250 upon which interest would accrue during the repayment period after graduation. A student who borrowed a full $15,000 ($14,250) would owe almost $17,570 upon graduation, on which interest would continue to accrue.
7. A state by state cap on the total of all educational loans issued. Under this plan, states with higher population and higher enrollment in post-secondary education would presumably be able to loan more than states with fewer college and university students.
8. A one-year moratorium on educational loans. No one would get anything, anywhere, any way.

Several of these proposals are designed to reduce federal expenditures on interest during the wait for a student's graduation(s). Since the Carter Administration's changes in GAPSFAS, which began to take effect in 1979, federal expenditures have trebled as students and parents realized it was smart to borrow money that was free for several years and even after graduation was only 7 or 9%, a much lower rate than that same money could earn if invested or that would be charged to post-graduation borrowers for mortgages, or car and other consumer loans. It was economically smart to let the government, and thus the taxpayer, pick up the interest for a few years.

Lammett-Reeves urges all students who received the GAPSFAS survey/ questionnaire last week to complete and return it to the box in the Student Activities (See Financial Aid, page 11).
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the travel proposals would be scrutinized by the Student Appropriations Committee (SAC) along with the regular budget requests.

As a result of the referendum, this process has been abolished. Any money that had been allocated by the SAC to student organizations for travel this year has been officially revoked.

SBA Treasurer and SAC Chairperson David Felius feels that the referendum "inhibits the function of the SAC and is generally disrespectful of the whole SBA committee system." Felius points out that when the travel policy was being decided back in September, he recommended that a new Travel Committee be established to deal with the organizations' individual requests as they arose. His proposal was voted down. "Now, in effect, the SBA has been turned into a travel committee, consisting of the entire House of Delegates," remarked Felius. SBA Parliamentarian Marshal Willick originated the idea of a Travel Referendum and authored the questions contained therein. He was very pleased with the turnout for the vote on the Referendum (almost 800 people voted) and wishes to thank everyone who participated. "It accomplished what I set out to do," says Willick, "to get a clear student consensus on whether travel expenditures were justifiable."

He stresses the importance of what he calls "participatory governing" by the people, and hopes it sets a precedent for the use of the referendum mechanism in the future.

When asked what would constitute an "emergency situation" for the purposes of travel funding, Willick answered simply "it's just what it says it is, an emergency." He gave an example if the student body president has to meet with officers at other school on a dispute with the administration. Willick stated that, "I can't conceive of any situation where student organization travel would qualify as an emergency." He further indicated that no organization whose travel funding was rescinded via the Referendum— "people who had expectations, plans, or had made prior reservations before the Referendum"—would be considered "emergency" cases.

Willick stressed that the Travel Referendum does not abolish the SBA Travel Policy, "except where the Policy is inconsistent with the Referendum"—that is, in procedure. Willick claims that the Referendum's official status is that of a "standing resolution" as established by the SBA Constitution and similar to by-law status. Therefore, "the organizations will never be able to include travel in their budgets from here on in."

Not surprisingly, the reaction from the student organization to the Referendum was not favorable. BLSA President Pamela Callowway was "deeply saddened by the execution and results of the Travel Referendum." She felt that the wording used in the Referendum was a "perfect example of unclear thinking and unclear drafting, which left many students wondering exactly what was being asked. Callowway complained that the voting area, which was the site of much "on-the-spot lobbying."

BLSA Vice Chair Robert Ellis, one of the more outspoken opponents of the Referendum, said simply, "I think we should question the objective human and rational value of any reactive plebiscite in view of the fact that even Adolf Hitler was elected."
Night Students

(Continued from page 1)

prident I. Brandon division. "The operation of the physical plant for us at night doesn't entail that much money. Evening students get a rough deal. We just don't get quite as much as we should.'"

"I think a lot of the services offered are adequate for the day students but then the school doesn't have the resources left to offer them to the night students," she continued. "Not enough resources are put into the evening students.'"

"Many of our complaints are monetary," admitted Bob L'Heureux, an SBA delegate for fourth year evening students. "Night students think that they get short shrift for their money.'"

On the issue of identity and needs, evening students were adamant about distinguishing themselves from their day school counterparts.

"The night students are less petty, less competitive, and less nerdy than the day students," fourth year evening SBA delegate David Honig asserted. "We've outgrown all that. We are more independent-minded and we tend to know what we want.'"

A first year evening student commented: "Most of us are reasonably experienced people who have assumed a lot of responsibility in our lives before we came here and I think the school, from time to time, forgets that we have proven ourselves to some degree in the professional world.'"

"The reasons we are here are different than the day students," another first year evening student noted. "We take ourselves a little more seriously and we're not as interested in the social aspects of the school.'"

Overwhelmingly, the Placement Office was identified as the greatest problem area for the night students. The most critical comments charged the Placement Office with a failure to attract those prospective employers most interested in hiring night students.

"The Placement Office doesn't serve night students at all," charged Bob L'Heureux. "The employers interviewing through the office here are looking for students of a certain age with law review credentials, whom they can mold in their own image. Because of their age and independence, night students aren't getting called for interviews.'"

"There is no way for us to capture the value of our work experience through the Placement Office. They are not bringing in employers looking for students with our type of experience and wants,'" he emphasized.

Other upperclass night students' complaints focused on the method of interview sign-ups.

"The biggest problem is the inefficiency of having to go in every day to check to see if your name was on a list," Peggy Stone commented. "Many times the interview timeslots were filled up by day students by the time we got there.'"

Tensions over Tenure

Deciding the Degree of Student Input

By Randy Haley

The Student Advisory Committee on faculty Tenure would like to play a greater role in long-term faculty planning, according to Chairperson Lora Liss. The nine-member committee, composed of a cross-section of GULC students, currently advises the separate five-member faculty committee regarding to faculty members up for tenure consideration. However, the student group has had little say concerning the Law Center's five-year faculty plan, according to Liss. The five-year faculty plan is the classified document that projects GULC's faculty composition both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Though I feel our present role is essential and we're not taken lightly by the faculty board, it would be nice if we could get hold of the 5-year plan document so that our committee could offer its separate input," she said.

"Richard Taylor (SBA president) would like us to pursue this avenue. We understand that the 'plan was a major topic at the last faculty retreat,'" she added.

This is important, Liss noted, because Georgetown, a law school which favors a scholarly faculty as opposed to one of practitioners, must plan early if indeed it wishes to attract and maintain such a faculty. However, in Washington it is difficult for a school like Georgetown not to attract first-rate practitioners. Neither the faculty nor student tenure committee judges the part-time or visiting faculty members.

"The volume of books and law review articles written is the traditional yardstick used to measure scholastic stature," Liss added.

Another of the student committee's complaints, though a minor one, is that it does not play a large enough role in judging a professor's various academic qualifications.

"GULC, we must be called upon to give the student point of view concerning faculty, yet I feel we are competent enough to judge a professor as a scholar as well,'" Liss said.

The "student role" seems obvious. As many GULC students are painfully aware, some of the greatest scholars on staff can be so esoteric as to make coffee and/or doze a prerequisite for each class.

Liss noted, too, that the student evaluation form is the key feedback tool for (See Tenure, page 12)
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Washington Is Most Difficult Job Market

By Abbie Thornor
Placement Director

As most of you may already know, the fall job market this year is significantly different from the peak hiring seasons in recent years. Although the number of employers interviewing on campus is up by 10%, the number of the positions they seek to fill is substantially lower. Numerous corporations and large law firms who traditionally recruit at Georgetown elected this year to curtail or eliminate recruitment programs at all law schools. Other employers in these same two categories kept their interview appointments but noted that they were considering applicants for 3-5 openings rather than the 15-20 positions usually available.

The Washington, D.C./New York City corridor seems to be the area in which the decrease in positions is most notable. Clearly, Washington, D.C. is distinguishing itself this year as one of the most, if not the most, difficult job market for young lawyers. The federal government budget cuts and reductions in force are contributing to a market in which the supply of inexperienced and limited-experience attorneys far exceeds the demand. In response to the changing and uncertain status of various regulatory agencies, many private firms in this city are responding with far more conservative projections of their own hiring needs. The result is far fewer jobs for GULC graduates who have decided to stay in Washington. Because each year 15-20% of GULC graduates have been hired by the federal government and another 20% have remained in Washington as associates with private firms, the decline in the Washington market is disturbing because 50-55% of all Georgetown graduates will frequently remain unemployed in one of these two cities rather than pursue jobs in more favorable markets elsewhere.

Even in these difficult economic times, more favorable markets for Georgetown students do exist. Each year a variety of employers throughout the southeast and southwest who actively seek to attract GULC graduates contact placement. Inevitably, these employers encounter very limited Georgetown student interest. This year, large and medium law firms from cities such as Miami, Atlanta, Dallas, Houston, Phoenix, and Salt Lake City have visited GULC but have had interview schedules that are only partially filled. Every year, the month of November finds employers scheduled to interview, but students unwilling to consider these alternative locations. Ironically, throughout most of the summer, law firms are expanding, salaries are increasing, and job opportunities are plentiful. This is not written by a Washington, D.C. job market prophet of doom, but seeks to provide a limited but realistic appraisal of this year’s market. Traditionally, Georgetown students have “placed” very well, and GULC placement statistics are, as a result, significantly above the national average. This year should provide no exception if all students will be more flexible in the size, type, and location of employer they will consider. Interviews will continue through November 20th and resume in late January. Federal government agencies and large northeastern law firms will be noticeably absent in this “late job market, but many medium and smaller employers from throughout the country will be represented. The “late” job market both on and off campus promises to be a very active one. All students should participate in it.

If you have any questions about these or other placement trends, please do not hesitate to contact the Placement Office.

Jessup Pickin’ Time

Georgetown’s 1981-82 Jessup International Moot Court Team has been selected and it promises to be one of the best. The team includes two third year students and three second year students, one from the Evening Division. The competition to get on the team was extremely tight and all of the judges for the orals and briefs praised the high quality of the work.

Here are this year’s team members.

Margaret Flaherty is a second year night student who works days at Winston & Strawn. She is well known to second year students as the winner of last year’s Beaudry Cup. Between 1975 and 1980 she was Director of Publications and Publicity for Bard College in New York State.

Gerry Hargrove is a second year day student from Evanville, Indiana. With an undergraduate degree from Indiana U. and a M.B.A. from Atlanta, Gerry includes in his experience three years as a Corporate Financial Analyst for the Philadelphia National Bank. Last summer he worked in the Bureau of International Organization Affairs in the State Department.

Bob Lawrence is a second year day student presently working at Ginsburg, Feldman, Weil and Bress. A cum laude graduate of Dartmouth, he was founder of the New Hampshire Public Interest Research Group, working on environmental issues and a State Institutions Project. Bob also worked for a time on the staff of Senator John Durkin.

Kurt Rasmussen is a third year day student from Leawood, Kansas. A magna cum laude graduate of Georgetown in economics, he has worked for law firms in both Kansas City and Washington. In addition, Kurt was a participant in the Attorney General’s Advocacy Institute where he honed his litigation skills.

Marshall Willick is a third year day student from Las Vegas, Nevada. He was Nevada President of Mensa from 1975-79 and has been active in state politics. Marshall has worked for several law firms, the U.S. Attorney’s Office, and has worked as a black jack dealer as well.

Between now and the middle of February, the team will research and write two memorials (briefs) on a problem in International Human Rights that involves two changes of government, one revolution, several massacres and as well as 30,000 boat people. It should prove interesting.

After that they will practice their oral arguments in preparation for this year’s Regional Competition in early March.

1981-82 Jessup International Moot Court Team. Bottom Row: Margaret Flaherty, Robert Lawrence; Top Row: Marshall Willick, Kurt Rasmussen, Gerry Hargrove

Blackmun Tells It All

By Lisa Betancourt

United States Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun paid an informal visit to the Law Center on Thursday, November 19th. At the request of Professor Judith Areen, Justice Blackmun came to speak before her Constitutional Law II class last week.

Justice Blackmun gave a brief, candid speech about the present state of the Court, its newest member, and the “evolving” body of constitutional law. He spoke very highly of the new Justice, Sandra O’Connor, calling her “a person of great intellect” and “a real trooper.” For the remainder of the two hour period, he gave the students an opportunity to ask him questions.

The members of the audience were all greatly impressed by Blackmun and what Professor Areen called “his warmth, wit and wisdom.” In one of his many amusing anecdotes, Justice Blackmun spoke of ex-Solicitor General Erwin Griswold’s assertion before the Court regarding the First Amendment. One of the Justices read from the Amendment, “Congress shall make no law” and asked Griswold what he thought the phrase meant. To this Griswold responded, “Gentlemen, we all know what it really means: Congress may make some law.”
Public Interest Jobs

By Diana S. Greene

For many law students, the job hunting process is at best, disheartening. It is often even more difficult, however, for those who choose to pursue public interest employment, given current economic problems, cutbacks in legal services, and the lack of adequate resources for locating available openings.

The GULC Equal Justice Foundation, with the enthusiastic support of the Placement Office, is rectifying at least some of these problems through the publication of a comprehensive directory of law-related public service jobs and internships available throughout the country. The idea for this project originated with EJF Board member Judy Berk, who is coordinating its compilation. The first edition will be available in time for the 1982 interviewing season.

EJF staff have already located several lists of public interest firms and organizations and will soon begin making this information available. In order to make this resource complete, however, EJF needs input from as many students as possible. Therefore, EJF requests that any student who knows of public service organizations in their hometown (or can find out about them on the upcoming vacations) write down the name, address, and contact person and leave it with Janet Giles in the Placement Office. Georgetown Law Center is fortunate in that it draws students from all over the country and this will be an invaluable asset in locating local organizations which might otherwise be difficult to find.

Any student interested in taking an active role in compiling this directory may leave his/her name and number in the Placement Office and he/she will be contacted by a member of EJF.

Placement Feedback

The Placement Office, in order to maintain accurate statistics and better advise students, is requesting that students report to us if they have: 1) gotten interviews—how many, 2) gone on call-back interviews—how many and when, and 3) received job offers—how many. The issue of job offers is most important not only in advising GULC students about job prospects, but also because we are required by the National Association for Law Placement to publish such statistics. Please provide this data ASAP to the Placement Office Staff—this is requested for both the GRIP Program and on-campus interviews.

J. Giles in the Placement Office is collecting the student feedback forms—labeled "Interviewer Evaluation." If anyone needs the forms they are available in the office. They will be valuable in determining the quality of the interviewer and the availability of information on the employer. This confidential data will be evaluated and general summaries will be sent to the employers. Please take the time to fill this form out if you interviewed on campus and have either positive or negative feelings about a particular employer.

In order to do long-range planning and upgrade the quality of our service, it is vitally important that students report to us regarding job statistics, but also with any comments, suggestions, or criticisms. We do seek to assist all students, but only by contact with students and general feedback can we accomplish this. Your cooperation will enhance the quality of this office and, therefore, the reputation of Georgetown Law Center.

We are now in the process of organizing a public interest consortium sometime in March. If anyone knows of a public interest firm or organization that students may be interested in, please relay this information to us and we will contact them.

The Placement Office is holding an Open House on December 1 from 3:00 to 5:00. All students are invited to come and share some wine and cheese.

Era Awareness

By Laila Atallah

If you've seen anybody wearing a green button with the number 8 on it— it's referring to the eight months left till the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Thirty-five states have ratified it; three more must do so by June 30, 1982 in order for the amendment to become part of the United States Constitution.

The National Organization for Women, which its members say is the world's largest women's rights organization with over 800 chapters across the nation, launched the "E.R.A. Countdown Campaign" on June 30, 1981—exactly one year before the ratification deadline—with 180 rallies around the U.S.

Betty Ford and Alan Alda co-chair the Campaign.

In August, over $1 million was raised for the Campaign through E.R.A. walk-a-thons. Last month, N.O.W. initiated the "Campaign Campus" to enlist college student ac- tivism in support of the E.R.A., and sponsored a series of nationally televised ads about sex discrimination.

N.O.W. has designated the week beginning November 30 as "Equal Rights Week." The Organization's goal is to make citizens aware of the full text of the Equal Rights Amendment, which reads:

Section 1: Equality of rights under

(See E.R.A., page 10)

GRIP Program and on-other potential speakers from diversified disciplines, cutting costs, and inviting other law schools in the area to partici- pate. Honig was appreciative of the con- structive suggestions, but acknowledged that some people "were merely picking the proposal apart." He agreed to try to encompass most of the "good" ideas into the program. The proposal was pas- sed by a voice vote of the House of Delegates.

SBA President Richard Taylor feels that racism is an appropriate topic since "seemingly everything we do around here is touched by the issue of race one way or the other." He feels that this project was not approved "to be a means to inform all these white people of how racist they are.

The SBA also took another step in the battle to keep tuition costs down. The delegates voted on the budget proposal the SBA will submit to the Finance Committee for the 1982-83 school year. In recognition of the current dispute on the state budget and student budgeting, the delegates agreed to take a $10,000 cut from the $50,000 that they received for dispersal to student organiza- tions this year. They also voted to decideto earmark the $10,000 to go to the Financial Aid Office to be distributed to needy GULC students.

Ruf Taylor calls the move "unprece- dented" and feels it is "a major step toward demonstrating to the students and administration our seriousness in keeping tuition down and beef-up finan- cial aid." SBA Treasurer David Felius also believes the action is a positive step, but is unsure if the funds can be specifically earmarked in this manner. He is confident and hopeful that they can be, but says he will "consult with Dean Rasmussen."
Exiled Guatemalan Describes Repression

By Lalla Atallah

Enrique Torres came and spoke to Georgetown law students about the problems affecting Guatemala—government repression, the growing armed movement against the regime, the poverty and bad working conditions most of the people suffer.

Torres got involved in labor law in his native Guatemala in 1975, a member of a profession which at its peak numbered no more than twenty-five lawyers. Now there is one labor lawyer left in Guatemala—and she has had to go underground and abandon her legal practice. The others, says Torres, were either killed or are living in exile.

The current regime of Colonel Lucas García considered these lawyers responsible for the development of the labor movement in Guatemala, says Torres, and had "at least five" of the lawyers killed.

"When that didn't work," Torres says, "they went after the union leaders and then their families."

"The dominant groups in Guatemala failed to see that the real source of the labor movement were not these individuals, but the bad working conditions and low wages."

Guatemalan labor law contains "right-to-work" provisions, outlawing industry-wide unions (i.e. organizing must be done plant-by-plant), and contains no unfair labor practice legislation. The only tools the lawyers had to work with were unforeseen "loopholes" and technicalities in the laws.

He traces the development of the labor movement to the extraction of the poor sections of Guatemala—where people live in adobe (dried mud and straw) houses or ravines on the outskirts of Guatemala City—by the 1976 earthquake.

The people and the Church organized in 1976. The movement brought success to the village people, says Torres.

"The union never comprised more than 3% of the work force, but the union capacity to mobilize their members."

The Lucas regime and the dominant groups in Guatemala saw the growth of trade unions and peasant organizations as a direct threat to the regime in power and a threat to the foundations of the Guatemalan economy. The view is that wages must be kept low to attract foreign investment, and that cash crops must be raised for export—at the expense of food crops for domestic consumption.

In order to retain political opposition, violence is widely used by the government forces. Human rights groups report mass killings of people of all ages, random shootings, cropping of villages, and burning of villages. Torres estimates that forty people die every week.

During the Carter administration, military aid to Guatemala was halted—but Guatemala continued to receive arms from Argentina, Taiwan, and Israel, and through cash sales from the U.S. (which were not controlled by Congress).

Torres reports that when Reagan was elected, the upper classes in Guate- mala "had a party."

The Reagan administration wants to lift the ban on military aid to the Guatemalan regime, and as part of his economic plan for the Caribbean, Reagan wants industrial "free zones" where U.S. corporations can produce their goods with cheap foreign labor. This goal is shared by the Guatemalan government and upper classes.

"To have the Guatemalan people not struggle for higher wages...the U.S. government is willing to support our military regime," Torres says. "This is no secret—Jack Anderson has made the same observation in his column."

Torres says he wants to see a peaceful "middle ground" develop so that changes can come about democratically, but he sees no such middle ground available while the government treats all political opposition or reform movements as Soviet-inspired plots.

Torres cited a history of anti-demo- cratic policies in Guatemala—from the CIA-engineered coup of a democratically-elected president, to the more recent rigging of elections and the murders of anyone perceived as a political threat.

Armed resistance to the regime is growing. Torres is convinced the people will ultimately prevail. "They have no choice now but to struggle. And the movement the government is in crisis, we will have our chance."

Trial
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Tapper, student chairman, responded that students have in fact realized that they are going to lose their school because someone else is paying money back. The maverick committee member noted that this was the same solution that would need to be studied for several years before being acted upon.

Ransmeier noted the potential accounting problems with the proposal. "The problem is a cash flow loss," he said. However, Professor Steven Goldberg suggested that the problem could be lessened by phasing in a deferred tuition program over a number of years. No member disagreed that the proposal should be studied.

Another Abneramy proposal was to separate the $40,000 expense for graduate exercises, from the regular budget. Students would then pay a separate mandatory fee for graduation. Under the present system, the expense is absorbed over three years in the regular tuition payment. Abneramy noted that the new proposal would encourage attendance at graduation exercises.

Ransmeier objected to the proposal as bad public relations. People would leave the Law Center, he said, with a bad feeling. Student members echoed the concerns, saying that students would feel like they were being forced to pay in order to graduate. Tapper likened the idea to the Yates Fieldhouse fee to which many students object.

Student Publications Questioned

In other action in last Friday's meeting, questions were raised concerning large increases requested by a number of student publications. Carter pointed out that the journal of Law Policy in International Business has asked for a 31% increase, and the Law Weekly has asked for a real increase of about 20% to offset rising printing costs. Carter noted the irony in students asking for no tuition increases while also asking for large organization increases. "The publications apparently haven't gotten with the SBA on that."
The Fall 1981 Uhuru Production, *Balls, Balloons, and Butterflies*, presented last Friday, was an original work by Georgetown law student Charles H. Hawk, III, which portrays the various ways in which people seek to effectuate social, economic, and political change from the perspective of a Black family in the midst of a tragedy involving government repression.

Photos By Carolyn Herterich.
Focus on Franchise
Congress Debates the Voting Rights Act

By Diana S. Greene

This is the second in the Equal Justice Foundation series of articles examining current legislation on major access issues. While 97th Congress Week has ended, EJF hopes that students' interest and involvement will continue as they learn more about these important issues.

This article relies on the testimony of EJF's national office on H.R. 3112 and S. 895 before the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, the House of the Senate debates on the Voting Rights Act, and reports of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

In 1960, John E. Wade, a black resident of Tuskegee, was denied permission to vote due to his inability to complete his registration form. He had underlined the word "Mr." on his card rather than circling it. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Report details countless similar examples. Disenfranchisement could result from misspellings, inability to obtain vouchers from 3 qualified white voters, "bad character" (including refusal to leave a public building when ordered to do so), and failure to explain constitutional provisions to the satisfaction of the white registrar. These measures effectively limited access to the polls. In 1960, ten states had a black population of more than 5 percent, but less than 10 percent of the eligible minority citizens in these states were registered.

The 1961 report concluded that while the Civil Rights Act of 1960 was a promising improvement over previous legislation as it expanded the ability of the Attorney-General to intervene in voting discrimination cases, it did not offer a long-term solution to the problem. State and local discrimination persisted to an extent too pervasive to be susceptible to case-by-case adjudication in federal courts.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1973 et seq., represented more than a revision of the Civil Rights Act. It offered new mechanisms for effectively implementing the right to vote. The Attorney-General was authorized to appoint federal examiners to supervise state or local elections upon the petition of twenty voting age citizens. Also, any state or political subdivision that had used any test or device as a prerequisite to voting and had less than 50 percent voter registration was required to submit any proposed changes in its voting laws to the Department of Justice for preclearance. Neither of these procedures required litigation, although any decision of the DOJ could be challenged in the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. Once a jurisdiction had triggered the preclearance requirement, it remained subject to them unless it could prove to the D.C. District Court

that it had not used any discriminatory test or device during the preceding 5 years (changed to 10 years in 1970).

A second study by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published in 1975 reported substantial progress in increasing minority access to the polls. During the ten years since the passage of the Voting Rights Act, registration of non-white voters had jumped to 56 percent of those eligible.

The report also described the continued use of literacy tests for those American citizens whose native language was not English. Consequently, Congress amended the Voting Rights Act in 1975 to require that registration materials and ballots be provided in a second language when more than 5 percent of the residents of a jurisdiction were members of a "language minority."

The Voting Rights Act has proven to be a more cost-effective means of redressing political discrimination than the adjudicatory approach envisioned by the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. Since the Act was passed, DOJ has found cause to object to only 2 percent of all election proposals submitted to it. Without the Act, the Attorney-General would have had to file or intervene in more than 800 lawsuits—an expensive, complex, and time-consuming process.

Today, minority voters are a substantial force in American politics, even in those states still subject to preclearance.

In Mississippi, for example, black registration has increased from about 7 percent in 1964 to 70 percent in 1981. It also has more black elected officials than any other state.

This does not indicate, however, that the Voting Rights Act is no longer necessary. Black representation in government is still far short of reflecting their numbers in the general population. For example, S. 175, which the DOJ objected to 411 election laws that were submitted to it for preclearance, and has objected to another 404 since 1975. While the discriminatory methods used are less obvious than those practiced in 1961 they are nonetheless effective in restricting minority access to the polls.

Three popular methods are: 1) "cracking," dispersing minority districts among several white districts; 2) "stacking," diluting a heavy concentration of blacks with an ever greater concentration of whites and 3) "packling," concentrating minority voters into a single large district. Since the Voting Rights Act was passed, DOJ has objected to 103 redistricting proposals, nearly half of which have occurred since 1975.

Other tactics include annexation of areas of white voters to areas which are likely to elect a minority candidate. DOJ has objected to such annexations once since 1965, more than half of which (149) have occurred in the past six years. Since 1975, the DOJ has also filed objections to 15 proposals to relocate polls, and 157 changes in the method of electing officials (i.e., switching to at-large elections to avoid the creation of a minority district).

All the provisions of the Voting Rights Act will expire in 1982, except the bilingual election requirements, which will expire in 1985.

On October 5, 1981 the House passed H.R. 3112 and thus extended all provisions of the Voting Rights Act until 1992. The bill also requires a more stringent standard for bail-out from the pre-clearance requirements, and allows political subdivisions of affected states to bai-out independently if they have not used a discriminatory test or device within the preceding ten years.

Three bills on the Voting Rights Act are currently pending before the Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution, S. 895, which would extend the provisions of the Act until 1992 and stipulates that pre-clearance would be triggered by any election practice that is discriminatory in effect if not in intent. This provision is a response to the recent Supreme Court decision, however, since it would provide equal access to the white House, but was defeated, 128-284.

The most recent Senate bill, S. 175, would completely eliminate bilingual election requirements. An identical proposal was offered as an amendment to the Voting Rights Act. Senator Hayakawa's (R-Cal.) bill, 53, would completely eliminate bilingual election requirements and provide equal access for enforcement purposes. Uniform extension of the preclearance requirements would appear to make little difference in the "regional discrimination" that opponents of the Act decry. EJF opposes the legislation, however, since it would greatly dilute the funding available to enforce the provisions of the Voting Rights Act against those jurisdictional changes it is not.

The Senate Subcommittee on the Constitution has scheduled eight days of open hearings on all three bills, beginning on January 12, in Room 222 Dirksen Senate Building from 9:30 a.m.

Therefore, there is still plenty of time for students to write to their Senators or even visit them before a final vote on this legislation is taken. EJF urges students to contact your home state senators and ask them to support S. 895. In addition, the members of the Senate Subcommittee should be contacted to urge them to report the bill favorably.

These include Senators Hatch (R-Utah), Thurmond (R-S.C.), Grassley (R-Iowa), DeConcini (D-AZ), and Leahy (D-VT).

Although all the provisions of the Voting Rights Act were passed in the House, there is reason to anticipate that it may face some opposition in the more conservative Senate and in Strom Thurmond's Judiciary Committee. The Voting Rights Act is one of the most significant and effective pieces of civil rights legislation ever enacted and it is imperative that those who support it make their views known.
Mac the Knife
By Ilise Levy
Witches, spirits, and the Thane of Glamis wererousingly brought to life (appropriately on Friday the Thirteenth) when the Washington Opera Company opened its new production of Giuseppe Verdi’s tragic opera, Macbeth, at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The Italian opera Macbeth is based on Shakespeare’s play. This production featured Juan Pons as Macbeth, and Olivia Stapp as Lady Macbeth. The production was directed by David Alden who has also directed at Wolf Trap and in other major cities. Cal Stewart Kellogg conducted the opera’s four acts. Costumes for the production were used through the co-operation of Teatro alla Scala, Milan.

Macbeth, Verdi’s tenth opera, was written in 1846, shortly before his most famous work, Rigoletto. This production successfully attempted to portray the sinister, medieval tone of Verdi’s music, by using creative lighting and theatrical effects from the twentieth century to underscore the play’s themes.

Smoke, fire, and fog enveloped the players in mystery that captured the audience’s attention throughout the unfamiliar but melodic opera. In the first scene, the witches’ chorus tossed soldier’s bodies across the gray battle-scarred stage. This set the tone for the opera, from the outset to the final curtain.

The somber mood was projected most dramatically in the third act when Macbeth faced the terrifying return of the apparitions. Ghosts and witches rose out of a smoke-filled pit in the center stage to tease and taunt Macbeth in a merciless chorus. Fearing the white-robed ghosts that paralleled before him, Macbeth hurled himself toward the throne at the rear of the stage in an effort to run from their evil words. But, in Verdi’s dramatic death scene, Macbeth could find no peace. As the music swelled, fire leapt from the center stage, turning the back of Macbeth’s throne into the awesome reflection of a pagan idol’s eyes. Finally, Macbeth, singing of his anguish and terror from the witches’ forecasts, falls upon the stage and dies.

The production also used lavish visual techniques in the final battle scene, thereby adding a new, theatrical dimension to the operatic rendering of Macbeth’s tale.

The Washington Opera Company is one of the youngest opera groups in the nation. Nonetheless, based on the audience’s positive reactions to the innovative directing and stage techniques exhibited in this production, there is good reason to believe that the company will continue to grow in popularity for a long time.

Trivia

1) Which Capitol Hill bar has the rear end of a deer over the entrance to the restrooms? A) Courteous B) 9:30 Club C) Bojangles
2) Where does the famous D.C. bartender, Baseball Bill work? A) Good Guys B) King Arthurs C) Shepard Park D) Haven Hall E) Fireplace
4) Which of the following bars does not have outdoor drinking facilities? A) Rumors B) Arties C) Runyon D) Bojangles E) Findlay
5) Which of the following bars does not have a lot of plants? A) Deja Vu B) Greenery C) Garrett’s
6) Which of the following establishments is not a topless go-go joint? A) Good Guys B) King Arthurs C) Shepard Park D) Haven Hall E) fireplace
7) Which bar had Guest Bartender Night on Wednesdays throughout the Fall? A) Sign of the Whale B) Chadwicks C) Windsor MacKays D) F. Scott’s
8) Which Georgetown bar, also known as the Pastel Palace or the Brooks Brothers Inn, plays 50’s and 60’s music on weekends? A) The Source B) Jalapenos C) Fake Meat D) O’ Neill’s E) The Kendall
9) Which of the following bars do not have outdoor drinking facilities? A) Rumors B) Arties C) Runyon D) Bojangles E) Findlay
10) Which of the following bars do not require a collared shirt? A) Sign of the Whale B) Chadwicks C) Windsor MacKays D) F. Scott’s
11) Which of the following bars do not have a lot of plants? A) Deja Vu B) Greenery C) Garrett’s
13) Which of the following bars does not have outdoor drinking facilities? A) Rumors B) Arties C) Runyon D) Bojangles E) Findlay
14) Which of the following bars does not have a lot of plants? A) Deja Vu B) Greenery C) Garrett’s
15) Which of the following bars do not have outdoor drinking facilities? A) Rumors B) Arties C) Runyon D) Bojangles E) Findlay
16) Which of the following bars do not have a lot of plants? A) Deja Vu B) Greenery C) Garrett’s
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Creating a Consumer Budget

For the first time in Law Center history, the sentiment of the community is dictating the shape of the budget. The potential has been unleashed this year for the creation of a truly democratic budget at the Law Center—one that will be responsive to the needs and interests of the consumers of legal education.

The consumer voices opposing a tuition hike are having a powerful impact. At the Faculty Meeting devoted to the Fiscal Year 1983 budget last Wednesday, Dean McCarthy prefaced his remarks by saying that "this is the year I intend to exercise caution in the size of the tuition increase."

The moment in favor of mass participation in the budget-setting process has been escalating steadily.

"The best thing about the Faculty Meeting," said SBA President Richard Taylor, "was that everyone realized there were students going to fight increases for the first time."

"Because we had our Town Meeting before the Faculty had their meeting," continued Taylor, "many of their responses were reactions to what we have expressed. We're doing something right."

The initiative is clearly in the hands of the majority of the community. It is now up to the SBA and the student members of the Finance Committee to take bold steps to insure that the community is not short-changed at the last minute.

The SBA must seize the initiative by drawing up its own version of the Law Center budget for fiscal year 1983. Such a budget plan would specify both the tuition figure students are willing to pay and the priorities they envision in apportioning the money to the various cost centers.

This consumer budget would be presented to the community for ratification at the next Town Meeting scheduled for December 1. It would then be the job of the student members of the Finance Committee to negotiate with the Law Center administration on the basis of the guidelines set by the Consumer budget.

The December 5th Finance Committee meeting would mark the end to the budget-setting process, but the beginning of a collective dialogue that would last until agreement among the competing interests had been reached.

The consumer budget is an expression of the struggle of students to wrest control of the educational process from the hands of administrative mandarins. Nothing short of this will do.

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor

Thank you for your article describing the work of the Juvenile Justice Clinic. I believe that such articles will enable second year students to make more informed choices regarding the selection of third year courses.

I would, however, like to point out two inaccuracies. I am reported to have described the D.C. welfare system as one of the worst in the nation. At the time we initiated legal action in Dobbs v. D. C. it was. Since that time considerable improvement has occurred. While it still has some problems, it no longer deserves its former distinction.

I was also reported to have said that one of the law center's shortcomings was an overemphasis on skills training. I did not say that. What I said was that many faculty members and students erroneously perceive clinics to be overemphasizing training in courtroom skills. As the Barnhizer reports point out, learning courtroom skills is but one aspect of the clinical method. Its primary purpose is to develop analytical skills and to test the results of that analytic process in a society. It would be beneficial to students and to the law center in general if clinics were not viewed as something separate from the mission of the law school. The goals of teaching the clinical method are not different from those teaching seminars or large lecture classes. Only the methods differ. These methods should be viewed as complementary. Both are necessary for a complete legal education.

Wallace J. Mlyniec
Director, Juvenile Justice Clinic

To the Editor

As Assistant Editor of the Advocate's GW National Law Center paper, I am in receipt of your October 26th issue. I was held spellbound by your "Letters to the Editor"—that was the most amazing collection of malice I've ever read!

Basically, at the NLC, we run a pretty blunt paper. So if you and your staff need protection (as some of the letters would seem to indicate), or just feel like retailing, give us a call.

David Braus
The Advocate
George Washington University
Law School
Registrar

J.D. Evening Students

The deadline for spring 1982 applications to transfer to the day division is Dec. 1, 1981. Applications will be submitted to the Registrar. See page 28 in the bulletin for detailed information.

Transfer approval is granted on a space available basis, and students will receive a notice in mid-December. Keep in mind that the division tuition is $3117.50 per semester.

Registration Confirmation

Spring 1982 Registration results were mailed last week. Add/Drop will be held for final exams. See the bulletin boards for exact dates and times.

Attention: May Graduates

All students who satisfactorily complete their first year of study after Aug. 1, 1981 must earn 83 credit hours in order to graduate. This is in addition to all of the other graduation requirements printed on pages 34-35 of the current bulletin.

Academic Regulations

The GULC Student Code of Conduct and to Insure the Rights of the Student. Responsibility is detailed in the AD-\

Extra credit will be given to the student who presents the best presentation. Copies of the code are available at the 4th floor Registrar's Office.

Late Hours

The Office of the Registrar will be open at 8:00 a.m. on the following evenings:

Dec. 1

Inlement Weather

It is the event of inclement weather (snow, rain), all segments of the Law Center, to include examinations, offices, clinics, clinics in

Library

LEXIS Training

All are invited to either of two showings of the LEXIS instructional videotape that will be presented on Monday, Nov. 23. The videotape will be shown at 1:30 in Room 1819 and again at 6:00 in Room 6. It lasts an hour and a half.

Barristers

Moot Court Competitions

Briefs for the Labor Law Moot Court Competition are due today at 8:00 p.m. at the BLSA offices. The competition will be on Tuesday, November 24 in the Moot Court Room. There will be one panel, from 5:30-7:30. Please check the exact time that you will argue when you hand in your briefs tonight.

Student Activities

BLSA

Coffee Hour- Sponsored by the Black Student Advisory

Tenure Committee

Our next meeting will be on Monday, November 23 at 8:00 p.m., in the Faculty Lounge.

The Interview Committee will report.

Classified

FINANCIAL AID

Continued from page 2

Lammert-Reeves says there is also a new loan program—ALAS, the Auxiliary Loan to Assist Students. GULC students are eligible for up to $3500 per year up to an aggregate limit of $15,000. Thus a student could, with both GSL and ALAS, receive $8000/year.

The interest is currently 14% but could drop as low as 12% if the Treasury Bill rate goes below 10% for a certain period. Since the interest is so high, Lammert-Reeves only recommends the loan to those who have exhausted their eligibility under other programs, either the $5000/year or the aggregate limit.

The Department of Education is still formulating policies and many states are taking a "wait and see" attitude. To date, only four states, Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts, have announced their participation in the income accepting applications. Other states may or may not participate. HELP-DC (Higher Education Loan Program-DC) has not yet announced its intentions but Lammert-Reeves expects more information about all states and HELP-DC during January.

The law establishing the program provides for credit checks with any consumer loan application. Individual lending institutions might choose to base the check on credit history (no history, no loan), on future ability to pay, or might require a co-signer. In addition, each lender can decide to let the interest accrue or be added to the principal pending graduation or can require monthly payment of interest while enrolled.

Lammert-Reeves suggests students interested in ALAS contact their GSL lender for details and procedures after January. Processing time is expected to be four to six weeks.
prem court Docke

Health Appeal

The 1981-1982 United Way/Combined Health Appeal Campaign is being held this year from October 1—December 1. The contributions goal for the Law Center has been set at $5,000.

The Campaign supports nearly 200 agencies of the United Way of the National Capital Area and the United Black Fund. These agencies provide community services ranging from care for the sick to youth organizations.

The Combined Health Appeal is an association of the national health agencies serving the National Capital Area, including such organizations as the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and the American Heart Association.

Total contributions from Georgetown University employees and the percentage of employees who contribute have both increased each year. During the past five years, Georgetown has led all institutions of higher education in the metropolitan region. This year’s university-wide goal is $50,000.

Pledge cards will be provided with paychecks, and payroll deductions may be authorized on the cards. Pledge cards should be returned to Anne Collins, Faculty, Support Systems, Law Center 427 by December 1.

Tenure

(Continued from page 3)

the student.

"Those forms are not filed away (in File 1A) as many students suspect but are looked at by both tenure committees," she pointed out.

Liss noted that (in borderline cases) the role of the forms and the student committee may be decisive. This does not make the committee superfluous in the process, however.

"Each element of the tenure evalua-
tion process complements and supple-
ments the other," Liss said. A commitment to Affirmative Action supplements the qualitative judgment of the student committee, Liss added.

According to her figures, 36 of the 64 full-time GULC faculty members are tenured, including one black female and two white females. Twenty-one members are eligible for tenure, meaning that they are in the tenure track system. Included are 15 white males; five white females; and one black male. The remainder are neither tenured nor in the tenure track system.

Liss was not certain what qualifies a faculty member to become eligible for tenure.

Although GULC rates well among the top law schools, in terms of female-minority representation, Liss feels that the school could do better. Sadly, she noted that the usual catch-22 could arise.

"If we stand pat and don’t recruit more women and minorities, we will all be the lesser. Yet, if and when we expand the under-represented on staff, these new people may be pointed to as unqualified-Affirmative Action beneficiaries... it’s the same old sad story," she said.

Still, Liss noted that Georgetown appears to be as evenly handed as any law school in this area. "It’s tough on everyone here... I’m sure the women and minority members familiar with the system here would agree," she said.

Though noting that the faculty committee and the faculty up for tenure, do indeed take the student committee’s advice seriously, Liss admitted that she could not pinpoint the degree of seriousness.

"Obviously, the faculty is not our peer and it would be silly, to hope or believe that our vote weights as heavily as theirs," Liss explained. The committee meets and submits its own report to its faculty counterpart when a faculty member is up for tenure. The student committee has not always been autonomous. For a time it were believed that students could provide better input if they sat with the faculty committee. Later, however, the group departed when student tongues became more or less shackled. "Student members would not speak as freely in the presence of faculty," Liss noted.

"The tradeoff, however, is that we now know less about the internal functions of the faculty committee, she added. "How much credence our motions are accorded is still a mystery to us."

Georgetown requires that each faculty member obtain tenure within seven years. Failure to do so is usually grounds for termination. However, if there is no tenure decision after seven years and a faculty member is rehired, he or she automatically assumes tenure. However, this "pocket tenure" does not extend to faculty tenure at other schools.

"There is no set policy for transferring entering faculty," Liss said. "Various amorphous factors are considered (e.g., previous school of employment, personal reputation, etc.). I can assure you that it’s not automatic," she said.

Harold of K
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