

College of William & Mary Law School  
**William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository**

---

Student Newspaper (Amicus, Advocate...)

Archives and Law School History

---

1986

## The Advocate (Vol. 17, Issue 8)

---

### Repository Citation

"The Advocate (Vol. 17, Issue 8)" (1986). *Student Newspaper (Amicus, Advocate...)*. 245.  
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/newspapers/245>

Copyright c 1986 by the authors. This article is brought to you by the William & Mary Law School Scholarship Repository.  
<https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/newspapers>





# Faculty Status Committee Votes To Deny Corr Tenure

By MARY ALICE ROWAN

Upon returning to school last week, students at Marshall-Wythe were startled to learn that the Faculty Status Committee has voted against extending tenure to John Bernard Corr. Corr, an Associate Professor at Marshall-Wythe and a member of the faculty since 1980, teaches Civil Procedure and Conflict of Laws.

Corr has declined to discuss the matter.

In response to the Committee's vote, a petition is circulating among the student body which calls for granting tenure of Corr. Signed by well over 300 students, this petition states that Corr "is able to teach students . . . in a manageable, easy-to-understand fashion," "always takes time to assist students outside of class" and lists five articles written by Corr and published in law reviews.

(The text of the petition appears on page two.)

"No one is questioning any professor's judgement and no one is disparaging the school," stated one student signer who wished to remain anonymous. "We students are simply disappointed about the tenure vote and feel the need to emphasize by everyone. It demonstrates a massive show of support for Prof. Corr." A group of students planned to present the petition of Dean Timothy J. Sullivan on Wednesday, Jan. 15.

The Student Bar Association has also addressed the issue. On Monday, Jan. 13, the SBA unanimously adopted a resolution recognizing Corr's "abilities as an outstanding professor," "superior publishing record," and "selfless devotion to the student body. The resolution concludes that Corr's "application for tenure and promotion . . . should be granted."

Several individual students have submitted their own letters in support of Corr to Dean Sullivan. Sullivan has declined to discuss the matter, stating "It is inappropriate for me to comment at this time."

The procedures for granting a faculty member tenure are outlined in a document entitled *Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure*, now on file in the SBA office. According to *Procedures*, the seven-member Faculty Status Committee submits a written report containing its recommendations concerning tenure to the Dean. The Dean makes an independent investigation and prepares a report containing his recommendations. If either report recommends against tenure, the affected faculty member may request a meeting of the entire faculty to consider the matter. The faculty may make ad-

ditional inquiry, and following discussion, votes on a recommendation. Based on the faculty recommendation, the Dean may reconsider and amend his recommendation and report. The written reports of the faculty and Dean are submitted then to the President of the College and the Board of Visitors. The official result is published in the *William & Mary News* in the spring.

According to *Procedures*, the "basic and most important criterion for . . . tenure shall be demonstrated excellence in classroom instruction, including helpfulness to students. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based on both peer and student opinion." Other criteria are "significant law-related intellectual achievement in activities outside the classroom," including

Continued on Page Four.



Prof. Corr lends a hand to runners at last year's Ambulance Chase.



Party time in the Parking Lot! Above, left to right, Dave Lozier, Joe Moan, Don Frinzi, and Pat Miller celebrate the end of fall semester. Below, Rick Kurtz, left, and Tom Kohler, right enjoy Dom Perignon following their Property final.



## Libel Night Approaches

Winter has come to the Colonial Capital, and the time has come for those crazy law students to prepare their annual festivity of satire, music, and self-humiliation, otherwise known as Libel Night. The 1986 edition of the popular show will be held during the first week of April. According to Terri Reicher of the S.B.A., Libel Night will tentatively be held at the Williamsburg Public Library. Due to the popularity of the show and the lack of space at the Library, the show may run for two nights.

The theme for this year's show will be loosely based on that of "Entertainment Tonight." Writers, ideas, and musicians will be solicited during the month of January. Plans call for the completion of all scripts by Spring Break. Stay tuned to your hanging files for further information. If you just cannot wait for more information, please contact either Terri Reicher or Margy McHugh.



Fun and antics onstage at Libel Night of yesteryear.



# The Advocate

Marshall-Wythe School of Law

A student-edited newspaper, founded in 1969 as successor to the *Amicus Curiae*, serving the students, faculty and staff of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law.

## To Deny Tenure

At this writing, over half the students of Marshall-Wythe have signed a petition asking that the faculty grant Professor Corr's appeal concerning his denial of tenure. The Advocate, too, supports Professor Corr's appeal. This school can ill afford to lose a professor of Corr's calibre.

First, Professor Corr possesses a classroom presence matched by few faculty this writer has encountered here or anywhere else - and I attended two colleges and worked at one before I came to Marshall-Wythe. He takes a potentially incomprehensible subject - civil procedure - and through "war stories," hypotheticals galore, and skillful Socratic questioning, makes it as straightforward and understandable as possible.

Second, although carrying impressive academic credentials, Professor Corr has not spent his life shut within the ivory halls of academe. He spent several years in courtrooms and law offices before coming to Marshall-Wythe - the courtrooms and law offices of New York and Washington, D.C. He participated in big-league litigation, with national-level firms slugging it out over incredibly high stakes. We aspire to be a national-level law school; can we afford to lose a national-level professor?

Third, Professor Corr was heavily involved in his firm's recruitment activities. He knows what firms look for in an interview, from what credentials are most impressive to what to order if they take you to lunch. Marshall-Wythe has two fulltime staff in a placement office serving over 450 students. Can we afford to lose someone like Professor Corr to supplement Dean Schoenenberger's advice?

We could go on and on, and we have dealt with only three of many reasons why Professor Corr should be granted tenure. If you too, feel this way, let the faculty know your opinion today. We can make a difference. (J.O.A.)

## Petition

### PETITION

We, the undersigned, believe that the Marshall-Wythe School of Law should grant the tenure application of Professor John B. Corr for the following reasons:

#### \*HIS TEACHING ABILITIES ARE SUPERLATIVE.

Through his thorough class preparation and clear manner of presentation, Professor Corr is able to teach students complex bodies of law in a manageable, easy-to-understand fashion.

#### \*HIS CONCERN FOR STUDENTS IS UNPARALLELED.

Professor Corr's desire to help students does not stop at the end of class. In fact, he always takes time to assist students outside of class, whether offering employment advice, helping them compose resumes and cover letters, or serving as a judge for the Moot Court teams' practice rounds.

#### \*HIS LIST OF PUBLICATIONS REFLECTS HIS ABILITIES AS AN ACADEMIC AND AN INTELLECTUAL.

As the author of the following articles, Professor Corr's analytical ability speaks for itself:

Supreme Court Doctrine In The Trenches: The Case Of Collateral Estoppel, 27 Wm. & Mary L. Rev. 35

Modern Choice Of Law And Public Policy: The Emperor Has The Same Old Clothes, 39 U. Miami L. Rev. 647

Criminal Procedure And The Conflict Of Laws, 73 Geo. L.J. 1217  
Retroactivity: A Study In Supreme Court Doctrine "As Applied," 61 N.C.L. Rev. 745

Interest Analysis And Choic Of Law: The Dubious Dominance Of Domicile, 1983 Utah L. Rev. 651

In short, we the undersigned firmly believe that the Marshall-Wythe School of Law, given its goal of achieving national prominence, can ill afford to lose an asset of Professor John B. Corr's caliber.

Thank you.

# Sixth Amendment in Peril

Guest Columnist: George Spelvin

If you practice in Virginia when you graduate from Marshall-Wythe, you may well find yourself as a court-appointed defense attorney, representing criminal defendants who can't afford a lawyer. The commonwealth reimburses court-appointed attorneys—but don't expect to get rich this way. In fact, don't even expect to break even. Virginia's fees for court-appointed attorneys are low—so low that they may well deny poor defendants effective representation.

Gerald Lee, author of "Who Will Defend the Poor in Criminal Cases?," an article in the December 1985 Virginia Bar News, surveyed several court-appointed defense attorneys. Lee found that they spent a minimum of 200 hours preparing to defend those accused of capital offenses. Yet, on the average Virginia pays court-appointed attorneys in capital murder cases only \$649—about \$3.25 an hour to defend someone accused of the most serious offense in our law.

Lee also points out that Virginia has the lowest maximum fee for misdemeanor and juvenile cases of any of the 50 states; the lowest average cost per case for court-appointed counsel in states with a predominantly court-appointed public defender system; and, with the exception of Arkansas in certain cases, America's lowest maximum fee for court-appointed felony trials. Writes Lee, "The fee structure basically has not changed in fifteen years."

Many court-appointed attorneys are young, with barely-established practices, small offices, and high bills to pay. (A note for anyone considering hanging out his own shingle: A copy of the Virginia Code alone costs almost \$1000.) They must pay rent, utility bills, and secretaries. In order to stay financially afloat they may well push court-appointed tasks aside in favor of better-paying cases.

The \$649 average for capital cases is particularly egregious. Death is the greatest penalty the state can impose—so great that many doubt whether the state can take a man's life. The adversary system envisions a fair contest between the prosecutor on one side and the defense attorney on the other. Yet what sort of representation can a defense attorney give for only \$649?

Some may say that lawyers have an ethical obligation to do pro bono work and that therefore, even the fees now paid to court-appointed attorneys are too much. But, as noted above, most court-appointed attorneys are young, inexperienced, and barely able to make ends meet; they cannot yet afford to invest much uncompensated time. Some may say that the private sector, not public funds, would be a better source of the money. But no private sector source has yet volunteered to pay these fees, nor is one likely to come forward. Some may oppose giving more money to members of an overpaid profession. But court-appointed attorneys are almost never senior partners who earn six-figure incomes in large firms; they are more likely earning \$17-25,000 annually. Finally, some say that court-appointed work is part of "paying one's dues" to become a full-fledged member of

the bar. But the court-appointed attorney system does not exist to train young lawyers. Rather, it exists because the Sixth Amendment guarantees a criminal defendant the "right . . . to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense."

Recently a Marshall-Wythe professor asked what I would charge to defend him in a hypothetical civil matter with about \$6000 at stake. I estimated \$750. "That's too

low," he replied immediately. "You've got your overhead to pay, and you might have to spend a whole day in court on this. You'd have to charge at least \$1200." That's almost twice what the Commonwealth pays those charged with defending a poor man's life. Virginia must raise its court-appointed defense attorney fees. Governor Baliles, are you listening?



## SBA Resolution

### RESOLVED:

The Student Bar Association of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law, with the goals of maintaining the school's high quality of education and high level of national recognition, noting that

WHEREAS Prof. John B. Corr has consistently demonstrated his abilities as an outstanding professor and teacher of law, as evidenced by his consistently high student evaluations,

WHEREAS Prof. Corr has established a superior publishing record, and

WHEREAS Prof. Corr's superior talents as an educator, and his selfless devotion to the student body of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law make him an indispensable part of the faculty of the School of Law,

HEREBY RESOLVES that Prof. John B. Corr's application for tenure and promotion at the Marshall-Wythe School of Law should be granted.

Adopted Unanimously, Jan. 13, 1986

*RL Hughes*  
SBA President

# The Advocate

Marshall-Wythe School of Law

Marshall-Wythe School of Law  
Williamsburg, VA 23185

EDITOR IN CHIEF .....	John Owen Alderman
Managing Editor .....	Doug Klein
Newsroom Editor .....	Liz Kauffman
Production Manager .....	Melanie Morgan
Copy Editor, Business Manager .....	Susan Hubona
Sports Editor .....	Michael Moroney
Production Staff .....	Bruce Gibson, Jerry Kilgore, Scott Sheets
Columnists .....	Doug Klein, Scott Sheets
Chief Reporter .....	Mary Alice Rowan
Reporters .....	Ken Almy, Emily Radford, Damien Horne, Jerry Kilgore
Photographers .....	Lee Bender, Andrea Caruso
Cartoonists .....	Wayne Melnick, Charles O'Brien, Slim

Published every other Thursday during the academic year except during exam and vacation periods. Funded in part by the Publications Council of the College of William and Mary.

Opinions expressed in this newspaper do not necessarily represent those of the entire editorial board or of the students, faculty or administration of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law.

Printed by the Virginia Gazette.



# Letter To The Editor

## Moot Court Catch-22

For many of you the first round is over and the decisions to go on have been made. Having found that it's not so hard and more than a little fun, no doubt most of you are committed to continuing in the tournament. After all, what do you have to lose? Nothing, really. In fact, the experience you gain in the intraschool competition is quite valuable. Besides, you've already expended the time, energy, and heartache to write the brief and to prepare the first round argument, so why not go on?

While I heartily encourage each of you having the opportunity to advance to do so, I direct this letter to those of you interested in being on a moot court team.

The benefits of moot court participation should be somewhat (perhaps sickeningly so) obvious to you by now. Extensive research and writing experience, as well as the opportunity to develop oral skills, are the recognized tangible rewards. Being on a team also allows one to indulge in the rewarding give and take process with teammates, a prospect that no doubt is most attractive to you after having written a brief by yourselves. This association with others on a single project was for me the most beneficial aspect of being on a team. Finally, moot court participation provides another line on the resume, which as we all know, never hurts. According to the Administration, this is the primary benefit sought for and achieved by participating.

While I will not challenge the superficial appeal of this logic, I should add that for many of you it will have little effect on your job search because you have already secured second year clerkships. For those of you not yet so fortunate, don't be fooled into thinking that moot court will get you a job. Although it is true that it can't hurt, it was my experience that few employers took notice of it.

You see, most law firms do not appreciate the significance placed on moot court at M-W nor the achievement reflected in being selected as a team member. This oversight may be explained by the fact that at many schools moot court participation is strictly voluntary and does not owe its genesis to a required intramural competition. To these employers, moot court is indeed little more than a resume-filler.

The burdens of moot court participation, however, may not be as obvious to you as the benefits, but they should be regarded at least as coequals when deciding whether moot court is for you. For instance, a single moot court competition can add 3-6 credit hours worth of work to a semester. You may not think that's too bad, but consider that moot court participants do not receive any credits. The reason most often cited for this denial is a College (the University, not M-W) policy that no academic credit can be

given for a program receiving college funding (that the College does fund the Moot Court Board and the Catch 22 of this situation will be discussed). Despite efforts by those affected by this policy in the past and at present, the M-W Administration has refused to seek a change in its College policy. The most obvious explanation for the Administration's refusal to represent the Moot Court Board before the College on this issue is its belief that moot court does not merit academic credit. Regardless of the reasons given, there exists little chance that academic credits will be extended to moot court participants now or in the future.

Moot court participation, however, does exempt one from the third-year writing requirement and has been parlayed into independent legal writing credits in the past. The exemption, attractive on its face, often has little practical significance for two reasons. First, by the time moot court teams are selected many of you will have satisfied the requirement with a seminar. Second, whether you have taken a seminar yet or not, many of you no doubt plan to in the future to lighten an exam load.

So, you don't get credit (note: I did get a letter once from the Administration acknowledging my team's achievement in a tournament). What about funding then? The College (the University not M-W) provides substantial, albeit partial, funding. The Moot Court Board's operating deficit must be met by entrance fees to the M-W Tournament and by team members. In other words, team members are guaranteed only a portion of their travel and lodging expenses and must pay for all other costs, including meals.

This is where the Catch 22 exists. The College provides funds, but not enough to pick up the slack. Because the program is College-funded, however, M-W cannot extend credits to participants. Not only has the Administration refused to seek a change in the College's policy, it has prohibited the Moot Court Board from soliciting alumni contributions to ease the financial burden team members experience.

Despite the negative tone of this letter, my purpose is not to dissuade anyone from participating on a moot court team if the opportunity arises. Rather, I hope to provide you with some facts and observations not available to me last year when I made my decision. My honest opinion is that moot court participation is not necessarily a good thing. There are other moot court team members who would take issue with me and for this reason I strongly encourage those of you interested in being on a team to talk with current team members so that your decision can be a well-informed one.

Jeff Barnes  
Class of '86



App Ad Warriors: Tom Zehle '87, and Charles O'Brien '87, right, engage in some extra-curricular advocacy before Monday's oral arguments.

## Toxic Torts

by Doug Klein '87

Old Blind Man Rehnquist looked out to the east and saw the lone, swirling wisp of dust rising from the prairie. Tex Blackmun sat next to him, leaning back in a wooden chair against the front of the dry goods store. It was just a slight cloud, but it grew larger. Old Blind Man Rehnquist made out the shimmering, wavering outline of a dark object in the distance. It's a man, he thought.

"Shhudd up," Tex said and spat on the wooden boards of the porch.

The image grew clearer and larger. A lean rider atop a lean horse. He had a dusty hat and a poncho with a stupid pattern on it. He had pin-stripe pants on and a silk tie. He was the High Court Drifter. He was Irving Brilliant, only Tex and the other feller didn't know that, yet.

He rode slowly, eyeing the town through thin eyes. His horse, also named Tex, walked slowly, eyeing the town through thin eyes. The people in the few houses in the town looked out their windows, eyeing with thin eyes the long stranger and his horse with a pin-striped saddle blanket.

"Howdy, Stranger," Tex Blackmun said, still reclining back in his chair. He spat onto the porch.

The Stranger didn't say anything. He just nodded and tied up his horse in front of the saloon next to the dry goods store.

"What's your name, Stranger?" Old Blind Man Rehnquist said.

The Stranger looked him dead in the eye and said, "Shhudd up." He walked into the bar. The air was cool and dark inside. Irving wiped his face with a silk handkerchief with his initials, "I.B.," in the corner. He walked to the bar.

"What'll it be?" Felix the bartender said, hardly looking up at the newcomer.

Irving gazed around the room. No one was there, except for a group of about six cowboys wearing loose ties and packing countersuits on their hips. They could mean trouble. Tex Blackmun and Rehnquist were peering over the twin swinging doors to the bar. Tex spat again. A small puddle had formed on the porch.

"Hey, you," one of the group in the corner shouted out, "Yeah,

you. You with the face. Nice shoes, buddy. What 'ya buy them from a catalogue or somethin'." The others at the table laughed.

They were litigators. Irving could tell by the way they talked. He turned away from them and faced the bar.

"Hey, buddy," the one at the table said, "I'm talking to you, you flamer. You're stinkin' the place up. I can't concentrate on my drinking, you smell so bad. Yo, buddy, I'm talking to you . . ."

Irving assumed he meant him. Felix the bartender leaned towards him.

"Those are some of Doc Warren's boys. I wouldn't try anything if I was you."

"You're not me."

"Well, you best get out of here, before they sue you or something. What do you want here, anyway, Stranger?"

"Just some work, that's all."

"Well, there's no work here, so get along."

Irving looked at him and said, "I'll be back."

He walked out. Tex Blackmun stood by his side and said, "If you want work, Stranger, some of the homesteaders need hands. That's if you're qualified."

Irving had a saddle bag full of resumes. "Thanks, old man," Irving said.

Rehnquist said, "Say, Stranger, what'd you say your name was?"

"I didn't."

Irving Brilliant strode to his horse and rode out of town.

Tex and the blind feller watched his image merge with the landscape under the blinding, Wyoming sun.

Old Blind Man Rehnquist said, "Gosh, I sure do love westerns." Tex spat. "Shuudd up."

Next Week: Will Irving find a job in the overcrowded prairie job market?

Will Irving reveal his dark, tortured secret?

Will Doc Warren and his boys terrorize the peaceful homesteaders?

Will Irving find love in central Wyoming in the late 1860's?

Will Tex stop spitting?

Stay tuned for the next thrilling episode of "Tax Lawyers On the Range."



# Polar Croquet: The Tradition Begins

The First Semi-Annual Marshall-Wythe Last Day of Classes Croquet Tournament was a resounding success and is sure to become a favorite tradition. Despite sub-zero temperatures, all participants enthusiastically claimed that they had a wonderful time (except one, who got mad, quit, and threw down her mallet in utter frustration). Paige Foxwell surprised everyone with an early lead and stayed in front, beating the closest competitor by at least four wickets.

The event was sponsored by the Marshall-Wythe Lawn Croquet Society. J. Douglass Kline

(misspelling his name egregiously), the Chairman of the Society, was excited over the success of the match. "Yeah, it was thrilling," he remarked. When asked if the event would be repeated on future Last Days of classes, he replied energetically, "Yeah, sure, why not." Mr. Kline also offered this incisive insight into Miss Foxwell's runaway victory: "Well, she's just such a WASP, of course she won at croquet."

Finishing second was Melanie Morgan, Social Chairperson of the Society. She was not at all disappointed by her performance, commenting philosophically, "Yeah!

Wheeee! Alright!" Mr. Kline finished third; no other participants completed the course. Miss Vanessa Valldejuli was declared Best-Dressed Competitor. She was attired in a black wool day-length skirt and red angora sweater, worn with black suede high-heeled pumps. She topped the ensemble with a stunning full-length mink coat. A simple string of pearls and Vuarnet shades completed the look.

On a less positive note, Scott Bailey was observed cheating on several occasions during the match. Witnesses reported that

Bailey was kicking his own and his opponent's balls and changing their positions to suit his purposes. Mr. Bailey's case will come up before the Society's Sportsmanship Committee later this month for possible disciplinary action. It's easy to see why Mr. Bailey was unavailable for comment. Mr. Bailey removed himself from the match at approximately the half-hour point, and was replaced by Charles "Chuckles" O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien made a fine showing, but was unable to win the match.

Finally, Lisa Bertini made it through two wickets before she

withdrew, complaining about the cold and lack of proper clothing. She will not face disciplinary action before the Sportsmanship Committee. She was, however, given a reprimand from the Society for being a general poo.

The Society hopes for an even bigger turnout next semester, so defending champion Miss Foxwell will at least have some sort of competition. Miss Morgan reported that the Society was thinking of holding a fundraiser, because "we're hoping to buy a croquet set. The one we had this time belongs to Eric Berghold."

## Female Football Finale

Marshall-Wythe can be proud of its female athletes, as the members of the two law school women's intramural football teams have demonstrated. Both teams finished high in the standings, the Learned Hands ranking second and Class Action third.

Returning for their second season, Class Action made another strong showing, turning in a 5-2 record. Head Coach Mike Holleran was pleased and proud, and attributed the team's success to the performances of QB Donna Larsen and receivers Jill Verdeyen and Marie Duesing. Other standouts

included linemen Alison Vadnais and Yvonne Griffin. Holleran's assistant coaches were Ted Fauls and Phil Lingafelt, with some help from Bernie Corr. Lingafelt will be taking over as head coach next year for the graduating Holleran. So long, Mike.

Class Action received the first of two defeats from this year's cinderella team, the Learned Hands. This team came to be only because Vanessa Valldejuli got tired of people talking about starting a team and not doing it. A majority of the recruits had never played football, so the first prac-

tices were... interesting. As offensive coach Bill Power noted, "We started out just to have fun, but after we won a few games we began to take ourselves more seriously." Under the guidance of Power and defensive coach Dale Barney, the Hands finished 5-2, losing to Delta Gamma in the championship game. Rookie QB (actually, everyone was a rookie) Leigh Ann Holt, and running backs Pat Miller and Melissa McKeithen formed a standout offense, while Jill Carson and Sarah Sullivan led an aggressive defense.

After the fun of a winning

season, the Hands were disappointed by their loss in the championship game. The score was tied at 0-0 at the end of regulation time, and both teams had touchdowns called back because of penalties. As Coach Power said, "But for a couple of plays in the overtime, we would have had a championship season."

The most exciting game of the season, however, was the matchup between Class Action and the Learned Hands. It was a hard-fought defensive battle; both teams were unable to score. With five minutes to go, linemen Diane

Mazur of the Hands and Cathi Wirth of Class Action crashed and went down, both injured. Wirth injured her shoulder, and Mazur suffered a broken wrist. She missed her exams and is still wearing a cast. The game then had to be called because of darkness. When play resumed the next week, the Hands scored and won the game, 6-0.

As the winter sports season draws nigh, watch for a killer female hoops team, a team rumored to include Professor Lynda Butler. Marshall-Wythe women look to continue their utter domination of the undergraduate female sports scene.

## Fair Notice

### Good Guys at Trinkle

The S.B.A. Social Committee, under the new leadership of Bill Cusmano, has announced that the Good Guys will be at Trinkle Hall on February 8. The Good Guys are based out of Richmond and are popular at the College. With such songs as "Fun Lover," "Bodyguard," and "Killer Amoeba," the Good Guys' form of rocking reggae should keep the dance floor packed. Admission will be \$3.00. Beverages will be served.

### Wadlington On Medical Law

Prof. Walter Wadlington, Visiting Professor from the University of Virginia and author of the textbook, *Cases and Materials on Law and Medicine*, will hold an informal discussion on legal issues in medicine on Thursday, January 30 at 5 p.m. in room 124. Issues may include the "malpractice crisis," careers in medical law, medical care of children, "death with dignity" statutes, and organ transplants. The discussion, sponsored by the Law and Medicine Club, is open to all.

### Nicaragua Program

The National Lawyers Guild is planning a program on Nicaragua toward the end of January. There will be a slide show and speakers who have traveled to the country this past summer. Watch for details.

### VITA

If you missed the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) training and still would like to volunteer, please contact Emily Radford or Howard Roth.

### SBA Study Group

The S.B.A. is now accepting applications for its Study Group. The purpose of the group will be to consider the relationship between the S.B.A. and its committees and other organizations. The group will make recommendations to the S.B.A., with the goal of improving the operations of student government and activities at the school.

The Study Group will consist of a chairman, three members of the S.B.A. Executive Board, and two members at large from each class. Appointments from the applications received will be made at the Jan. 20 meeting of the S.B.A. The Study Group will make its report to the S.B.A. no later than February 24.

## Corr

Continued from Page One.

publications, "active participation in matters involving Law School or College governance," and possession of the necessary professional education, "experience and degrees." The burden of demonstrating fulfillment of these criteria is upon the faculty member whose status is in question.

"Students have asked me what they can do to affect this process," states Prof. John Levy, Chairman of the Faculty Status Committee. "At this point, the body to whom

one should direct comments is the faculty as a whole. Comments should be submitted to the Dean, who will keep a file and make it available to the faculty."

Obviously concerned about his status, students are already contemplating life at Marshall-Wythe without Bernie Corr. States B.G. Brooks, a third-year student, "I have enjoyed having Prof. Corr as an assigned faculty advisor, a teacher, and a friend. I hope that others will, too."



"Darn! I should've used Gilberts!" (Sharon Padgett '87 at the Wailing Wall.)