Corr Controversy Melts Down

by Gerry Gray

John Bernard Corr, former Associate Professor at Marshall-Wythe School of Law, has filed suit against the College of William and Mary. His complaint alleges breach of contract, violation of his constitutional right to free speech, and defamation by officers of the College. The lawsuit stems from Corr's failure to receive tenure in 1986.

"By 1985, the faculty at the School of Law was starting to become divided. By the time Dean Sullivan recommended against awarding Corr's tenure in 1986, the faculty had become factionalized. A faction consisting of about one-third of the faculty became affiliated with Dean Sullivan. Defendant Coven was part of this faction. The remaining members of the faculty (about two-thirds) were not part of the Sullivan faction or 'in faction.'

-excerpted from the complaint filed by former Associate Professor J. Bernard Corr

Sullivan stated that Corr had a reputation among many students as a good teacher. When the student body learned of his impending tenure denial, 250 of them signed a petition urging that Corr be denied tenure. In their answer, Sullivan agrees that his vote was in good faith, or both. This year's Appellate Advocacy program was again a "grueling," at least "taxing," process accordant to students involved. Students who took the course virtually the entire second-year class participated in oral arguments as part of the "App Ad" tournament last week.

The class, mandatory for all except those who attain editorial positions on Law Review, required students to prepare a 40-page brief the first semester and argue the issues from the brief before a panel of "judges" the second semester.

In evaluating this year's program, Prof. Michael Hillinger said, "There are always glitches, but I felt it went well. The judges were impressed by the fairly high standards of advocacy our students displayed." In terms of administration, he hopes students will be able to review briefs in 2-3 weeks. Grades will come out later with other spring semester grades.

2L's Practice Oral Skill

This year's Appellate Advocacy program was again a "grueling," or at least "taxing," process, according to students involved. Students who took the course virtually the entire second-year class participated in oral arguments as part of the "App Ad" tournament last week.

The class, mandatory for all except those who attain editorial positions on Law Review, required students to prepare a 40-page brief the first semester and argue the issues from the brief before a panel of "judges" the second semester.

In evaluating this year's program, Prof. Michael Hillinger said, "There are always glitches, but I felt it went well. The judges were impressed by the fairly high standards of advocacy our students displayed." In terms of administration, he hopes students will be able to review briefs in 2-3 weeks. Grades will come out later with other spring semester grades.

Continued on Page Seven.

Continued on Page Eight.

Corr, Coven, and Nichol

Corr's complaint claims that his ostracism began in December 1984 when the faculty met to decide whether to offer employment to Gene Nichol, currently Catalyst Professor of Law. Corr states that Coven became "emotionally disturbed" when he and other junior faculty members expressed certain reservations about hiring Nichol. In their answer, Sullivan and Coven state that they have no personal recollections of Corr's making such statements about Nichol. Their reply agrees that Corr supported the hiring of Nichol, but denies that Corr ever became upset over opposition to the hiring of the professor. The faculty subsequently voted to offer Nichol employment.

Corr further alleges that he met with Coven after the meeting and "Coven stated that it was easy to falsify a tenure evaluation, that he had just falsified a tenure evaluation in a favorable way, and that it was just as easy to falsify an evaluation in an unfavorable way." Corr claims that Professor Coven threatened to falsify Corr's tenure evaluation in an unfavorable way because he had spoken against Coven's view on the hiring of Nichol.

The answer on file admits that Coven and Corr did speak after the faculty meeting, but denies Corr's account of the content of that conversation. FSC, Sullivan, and Faculty Weigh.

In his complaint, Corr claims that Coven's subsequent vote against Corr at a Faculty Status Committee (FSC) meeting was made in bad faith because Corr had spoken against the hiring of Nichol. The denial filed by Murphy reads that either Coven did not vote against Corr, that his vote was cast in good faith, or both. The FSC is charged with gathering all relevant materials and making the initial review of a faculty member up for tenure. The committee issued a report recommending that Corr be extended tenure. The vote was four in favor and two against, with one abstention.

Sullivan's written recommendation, dated January 3, 1986, went against the FSC recommendation. He recommended that Corr not be granted tenure, primarily because Corr failed to meet the requisite publication standard by the College of candidates for tenure. On February 3, 1986, the law school faculty voted 17-4 to recommend that Corr be given tenure. Despite the vote in favor of Corr, Sullivan did not change his opinion.

Moot Court champions: (1 to R) Best Brief, Appellant, Bob Lewandowski and Michael Lederman; Tournament Finalists Larry Genaeri and Mike McCauld; Best Brief, Appellee, Tracy Mayes and John Hayes.
Exam Questions Answered

by Phillip Steele

What began as a first-year frenzy over potential grades subsided after grades were issued and left only one question: Where did that old exam go? Most students are familiar with the story, if not the facts. As usual, Professor Ronald Rosenberg had put several old property exams on reserve last December. Two to three weeks before the exam, a 1986 Fall exam disappeared from reserve. No one notified Rosenberg or any administrative dean. Rosenberg said.

Come exam time, people could bring anything except commercially prepared material, according to Rosenberg. The exam contained an essay question he admits was "structured along the same lines" as a question on a 1982 Fall exam but with name changes and several factual changes.

Overlapping Exams?

A copy of this 1982 exam obtained from third year students circulated among some first-years before the exam, and some had a copy with them while taking the exam, said First-year Student Bar Association Rep. Scott Finkelstein. Finkelstein said protests flew as soon as students walked out of the exam room. "Twenty to 25 people approached me right away," he said, after learning that some students had copies of a past exam question that was used again.

Apparent knockoffs also began that parts of the 86 exam were duplicated in the exam. Rosenberg, however, said there was no overlap. Rosenberg's copy of the '86 exam has no multiple choice questions; it is entirely essay.

As an SBA Rep, Finkelstein notified Dean Connie Galloway of the complaints. He said several options were discussed, such as giving another exam or giving all Pass grades, but were rejected as being unfair to those students who had scored high grades without the aid of the 82 exam.

Rosenberg and Galloway "decided the best thing to do was grade the exams and see how they came out," according to Rosenberg.

"I did not notice any unusual patterns, such as a student doing very well on that essay question but not on other parts of the exam," he said.

When the grades came out, they were "the highest average grades I've given in six years," Rosenberg said, but they were not inordinately high. "The difference between this year's fall grades and last year's fall grades is about .02." Assuaged by Grades

Although he made it known that he wanted to hear complaints, Rosenberg said that after grades were issued, there was no student approaching him. Of 15 who came to review their answers, none complained of the reserve exam.

A first-year student who was one of the first to complain to Finkelstein, but requested anonymity in this article, said that seeing good grades has assuaged most people but the student is troubled that "there was a breach of the honor code. Someone had to have stolen the reserve exam." Finkelstein agreed that after grades came out, "it just sort of blew over. People don't seem to be upset anymore but are disappointed in Professor Rosenberg. We approached him to prevent a student from coming up with new questions in defense. Rosenberg said only a certain number of issues can be examined in a basic course and some repetition is unavoidable.

Stricter Controls

He was "amazed that the '82 exam existed outside of my office. Six years is a fairly long time." He said he always has required students to turn in the exam questions with their social security numbers on it. But that does not prevent a student taking the exam in the library from copying the questions, he added.

Finkelstein, however, said no social security numbers were placed on exams in his knowledge and that "it would have been easy to carry the exam questions out after it was over." Although the missing reserve exam did not overlap with the actual exam, Rosenberg said that several improvements might be made, such as stricter accounting for exam question sheets and a procedure for bringing the disappearance of any reserve exam to the attention of the administration or the professor.

As for this exam, Rosenberg said that in the future he plans to check his old exams to make sure questions are not too similar.

Moot Court Teams Selected

In a generally smooth but occasionally tense selection process, Moot Court team members were named for the 1988-89 season on Friday afternoon. The selection took place over the course of three hours.

At the initial selection meeting, the top eight Appellate Advocacy ("App Ad") tournament finalists chose which teams they preferred among the eleven teams entered by M-W in seven major tournaments across the country. The other 21 finalists and three alternates filled in the remaining slots in order of their overall scores. These scores were calculated by averaging all the points each finalist received from judges for all of the oral arguments he or she participated in, in factoring in the finalist's score on the App Ad Brief of 30%, and weighting the scores on the basis of how many tournaments round the finalist survived (e.g., top 8, top 8, top 2).

"Agonizing" Deliberations

The initial group agonized over their decisions, running thirty minutes over the expected time for the meeting. The sticking point at that meeting and the subsequent one was that some teams, particularly the National and ABA teams, were simply more prestigious than others. Six of the top eight made the National team, filling all slots.

Attendees at the meeting described the process as "slow and painstaking," "arduous," and even "agonizing," although they also commended the participants generally for refraining from "backbiting" and remaining "honest and sincere." Joseph Ger­ basi said the members had a "thoughtful" attitude that would carry over to the upcoming tournament.

Elizabeth Delinger agreed, adding a personal note: "I want everyone to know that I'll work through the week, but I will go to happy hour (on the weekend)." Delinger, the only female:Na­ tional team member, said that she thought it was important that women be represented on the National team. Teammate Steve Minter concurred, saying that "women bring a diversity to style and approach" of a team's argument that went beyond any notion of "tokenism."

ABA Tournament Avoided

Jeff Mazzeo, Chief Justice of Moot Court, noted that the second meeting "went more smoothly." After some initial discussion, the attendees declaimed against discussing personal interests and team­ mate preferences to see if conflicts could be eliminated, opting instead for the simpler method of having finalists call out their preferred slots in order of ranking. Despite its prestige, "people stayed away from the ABA tournament like you wouldn't believe," said Mazzeo. This was probably because the tournament takes place one month from now.

David Losier, teaching assistant for App Ad, praised the finalists. The quality of arguments overall was "excellent," he said. "We have no sleepers on this year's team, which is "stronger... than in past years." Of the selection process, Losier commented that on the whole, "most people got what they wanted."
Students Taking Suit

by Lee Bender

While most of us at Marshall-Wythe toll about here in our student-like ways, studying and reading about other people’s legal problems, three problems recently have found it necessary to individually take the law into their own hands—in the traditional manner, of course. Sheila Venable, Kimberlie Young and Fern Lavelle have not been afraid to each file and pursue lawsuits when some not too friendly sorts have sought to jerk them around. The cases involved, respectively, a rent dispute, a tuition dispute, and an auto accident.

Sheila’s case is perhaps the most interesting and complex. Before she began law school in the fall of 1985, Sheila lived in a rent-controlled apartment in New York City owned by real estate magnate Harry Helmsley. She did not tell Helmsley, the landlord, that she was going to law school out of state, nor felt she even had to tell him she was leaving New York temporarily for educational purposes. Sheila still was and intended to remain a New York resident—i.e., she had paid the rent she presently owes that has accumulated since her last payment a year ago.

Kimberlie’s story began in the spring of 1985 when she was accepted by LSU to attend its law school. During that summer, LSU offered her free room and board and a stipend for her graduate assistant to be in charge of 90 freshman girls in a dormitory. Kimberlie accepted the offer and signed the contract at her home in Virginia Beach.

But, when she arrived at LSU for registration in August 1986, the head of Residence Life at LSU refused to grant her the tuition waiver she was told was a part of her acceptance offer. Apparently, it was the judge’s decision to strike the student’s answers and jury demand, but granted his motion to sever the counterclaim. As it turned out, this is exactly what Sheila wanted. Last week Sheila petitioned the Southern District of New York to dismiss Helmsley’s motion to strike her answers and jury demand, but granted his motion to sever the counterclaim.

Kimberlie’s situation has raised the issue of whether the Alan Maser is of an entirely different species. She is suing Louisiana State University (LSU) for breach of contract and is seeking monetary damages.

Kimberlie’s story began in the spring of 1985 when she was accepted by LSU to attend its law school. During that summer, LSU offered her free room and board and was going to law school out of state, nor felt she even had to tell him she was leaving New York temporarily for educational purposes. Sheila still was and intended to remain a New York resident—i.e., she had paid the rent she presently owes that has accumulated since her last payment a year ago.
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INTER ALIA

Leaving

Everything comes and goes. When Gene Nichol and Glenn George, two of the most respected and accepted professors on our faculty, announced their planned departure last semester, most of us in the Marshall-Wythe community sensed a real loss. Particularly, their departure was significant because, as most of us are aware, the two professors had originally met each other here. But we all know that the offer Nichol has received is tremendous, and feel that Nichol, George, and Jessie belong in Colorado.

For this semester, Professor Doug Rendleman returned from a semester visiting at Washington & Lee and announced that he was leaving to accept a chaired position at that school. Rendleman, also popular among students, is best regarded in his area of specialty, remedies, and has taught at this law school for a tenure which has lasted twelve years. But, again, we are cognizant that W&L, our in-state privately-run rival, was probably able to tender a nonoffer to Rendleman. More recently, Professor Ed Edmunds, deemed by some to be the only palatable part of the first-year legal writing program, announced that he, too, would be leaving at the end of the current semester to join the faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans.

The departure of four faculty members in the course of an academic year, all of whom have spent one or both semesters of this year on leave visiting faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans, among recently, Professor Ed Edmunds, deemed by some to be the only palatable part of the first-year legal writing program, announced that he, too, would be leaving at the end of the current semester to join the faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans.

The departure of four faculty members in the course of an academic year, all of whom have spent one or both semesters of this year on leave visiting faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans, among recently, Professor Ed Edmunds, deemed by some to be the only palatable part of the first-year legal writing program, announced that he, too, would be leaving at the end of the current semester to join the faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans.

The departure of four faculty members in the course of an academic year, all of whom have spent one or both semesters of this year on leave visiting faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans, among recently, Professor Ed Edmunds, deemed by some to be the only palatable part of the first-year legal writing program, announced that he, too, would be leaving at the end of the current semester to join the faculty of Loyola College in New Orleans.
Saprophytism
by Jeff Yeats

Where was it? Meandering about on some quadrennial Sadie Hawkins still up in a shoebox? Or was it in the spring swallow, then the hillside, then the spring swallow, then the hillside? Well, almost two weeks later, I still don't have an offer. Not only that but no one thought enough of the idea to bring it up at the MBA meeting.

I thought it would be a fun idea, even though I didn't really expect an offer. After all, an offer might elicit an acceptance, which would carry with it enough money (and hope, if not possibility, a certain expectation or two. Naahh, it's just probably because I can't dance.

Or it could be because I was socially promoted out of high school. Those who don't readily grasp the concept, a social promotion goes something like this:

**ADMINISTRATION**: "Do you swear on whatever warped sense of underhand you recognize that you will never again be made to suffer your presence?"

**ME**: "I do."

**ADMINISTRATION**: "Then take ye your diploma, your $ 0.00, and your undesirable habits, disruptive attitude, your degenerate Addictions and stay the hell off this campus!"

**ME**: "It's a deal.

Now that's a meeting of the minds. They even cut me loose in March, they were so glad to be rid of the pest. I was working when the actual sheepdogs changed hands in May. Broke my deal when I dropped by school to pick up my body copy, the sheepdog seemed to mind.

It was a good deal for all concerned. With all the additional time on my hands, I discovered all sorts of new things, I wanted to know about, things that needed to be grappled with. And I needed to know, not simply a refinement of my ability to manipulate words or a reminder of my inability to figure fractions into decimals.

I was learning about my profession. After some success in the outside world, I decided to try the structured method again and found that the system could work for me.

That's all well and good, and now reading the law and writing this article keep me off the street. But, friends, I am beginning to see the full extent of that latent lesson and it took the voters of Iowa to help me recognize it. The hard cold reality is this: George Bush is seeking the White House and I decided to stay to see who would win.

Social promotions serve a purpose in a system, they provide the tools for the redress of dissent. They keep the necessary flow of warm bodies moving along and, yes they may even offer an opportunity where one might try, but it lies in a place that has never have otherwise existed. Still, it's a poor way to choose people for leadership positions.

Legal ethics, an intimate knowledge of weapons, an ability to kill a man with a weapon, a basic course in eddy redress of dissent, is the so-called Socratic Dialog. A bizarre fellow by any standard. If the old bugger were alive today, no doubt he would have gone to Harvard (smoking dope with Ginsberg, Gore, and Leary while there), talked trash about the Senator from Pizza Hut, and eventually ended up confusing students in seminars. The so-called 'Socratic Dialog'.

Using the Socratic dialogue, Socrates would break down a student's belief, his inter­rogatory suggestions and destruct­ive cross-examination. Socrates was never one to look for the answer and then search for an answer than finding the answer itself. Needless to say, I haven't been disappointed in learning that the Athenian government branded the old windbag an "enemy of democracy," accused him of "cor­rupting the young," and condemn­ ed him to die by drinking hemlock.

Imagine my horror upon enter­ring the hallowed halls of Marshall- Wythe to discover that most first­year and some upperclass classes were taught using the "Socratic method." As it is supposed to work, the instructor queries the class as to the holdings of a case, asking probing but revealing ques­tions in an effort to lead the class toward the correct principles of law. This assumes, of course, that someone in the class knows enough to respond to or ask a per­tinent question and that the in­structor class everyone in whom we've reached the correct solu­tion. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. More than once I've understood the material better going into the class than coming out of it, and mailing pills to a wall is oftentimes easier than pin­ning down an evasive instructor on a point of law.

At least in the first year, use of the Socratic method results in the formation of a student body, a group that relies solely upon class notes and their own newfound lawyerly analytical skills to prepare for ex­ams. They are usually identified the night before the exam by the desperate manner in which they

from the Right
Kill Socrates - Again
by Mike Davidson

As a young, budding, modern­day Renaissance man, I felt com­ pelled as an undergraduate to sub­ject myself to a level course in legal ethics. What little philosophy I was exposed to bored me to tears, an philosophy generally in­volved nothing more than a bunch of old men sitting around babbling about things of no consequence. If I hadn't wanted to see that, I could have tuned in to any television channel and watched the Democratic response to President Reagan's State of the Union Ad­dress. The world babbler of the day was Socrates. He started out well­enough—serving as a holp in the Peloponnesian Wars, but then got really weird, quit work, and developed the infamous "Socratic Dialogue." A bizarre fellow by any standard. If the old bugger were alive today, no doubt he would have gone to Harvard (smoking dope with Ginsberg, Gore, and Leary while there), talked trash about the Senator from Pizza Hut, and eventually ended up confusing students in seminars in law school.

Using the Socratic dialogue, Socrates would break down a student's belief, his interrogatory suggestions and destructive cross-examination. Socrates was never one to look for the answer and then search for an answer than finding the answer itself. Needless to say, I haven't been disappointed in learning that the Athenian government branded the old windbag an "enemy of democracy," accused him of "cor­rupting the young," and condemn­ed him to die by drinking hemlock. A happy ending to an otherwise sad story.

Imagine my horror upon enter­ring the hallowed halls of Marshall­ Wythe to discover that most first­year and some upperclass classes were taught using the "Socratic method." As it is supposed to work, the instructor queries the class as to the holdings of a case, asking probing but revealing ques­tions in an effort to lead the class toward the correct principles of law. This assumes, of course, that someone in the class knows enough to respond to or ask a per­tinent question and that the in­structor class everyone in whom we've reached the correct solu­tion. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. More than once I've understood the material better going into the class than coming out of it, and mailing pills to a wall is oftentimes easier than pin­ning down an evasive instructor on a point of law.

At least in the first year, use of the Socratic method results in the formation of a student body, a group that relies solely upon class notes and their own newfound lawyerly analytical skills to prepare for ex­ams. They are usually identified the night before the exam by the desperate manner in which they
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Attention Alumni

There is a small country far, far away. It is a relatively poor country, but it lies in a place that has been a crossroads to empire and so, many conquerors have come through it. But most have been small. That is among other people who are practically born with weapons in hand. Why? You see, the men from this small country kept their martial skills sharp by killing one another. In some of our tribes it is one's duty to kill a relative that brings disgrace on the family. (And I think report­card time was rough at my house.)

The famed Ghurkas come from the same region in the embattled country of Afghanistan.

Not so long ago a conqueror decided to stay while. Not long ago relatively that is. To the Soviets, their eighteenth century, the Afghan "rebels" may seem like a whole lot longer. Welcome to Vietnam, Mr. Gorbachev. What must it be like to watch one of the world's largest and most sophisticated war machines be baffled, frustrated, and battered by a few thousand men with almost no sophisticated weaponry, an intimate knowledge of the terrain, and a strong desire to rid their land of a superpower's military?

Now the Russians want a way out. They are haggling with the U.S. over the terms of a staged withdrawal. The U.S. is in the cat­bird seat. We don't have to give up everything because the Soviets badly need to find a way to cut their losses in money, morale, and prestige. We can afford to go further than we shall, plenty because the Russians have no idea how to win the conflict militarily any time soon.

The leader of the puppet regime that is at least nominally running the country, Mr. Najibullah, seems loath to wave goodbye to the estimated 120,000 Soviet troops that now occupy "his" country.

This seems a strange attitude for the man who would then be free to lead his adhering people to prosperity.

Perhaps Mr. Najibullah is a student of history. There were some other invaders here once that also decided to stay. The British, like the Russians, men with superior technology and military resources. Like the Russians, they were never able to control the rugged countryside. When the situation began to get hot they decided to leave. Three thousand people left to die by drinking hemlock.

Baby Barristers
by Will Murphy

There is a small country far, far away. It is a relatively poor country, but it lies in a place that has been a crossroads to empire and so, many conquerors have come through it. But most have been small. That is among other people who are practically born with weapons in hand. Why? You see, the men from this small country kept their martial skills sharp by killing one another. In some of our tribes it is one's duty to kill a relative that brings disgrace on the family. (And I think report­card time was rough at my house.)

The famed Ghurkas come from the same region in the embattled country of Afghanistan.

Not so long ago a conqueror decided to stay while. Not long ago relatively that is. To the Soviets, their eighteenth century, the Afghan "rebels" may seem like a whole lot longer. Welcome to Vietnam, Mr. Gorbachev. What must it be like to watch one of the world's largest and most sophisticated war machines be baffled, frustrated, and battered by a few thousand men with almost no sophisticated weaponry, an intimate knowledge of the terrain, and a strong desire to rid their land of a superpower's military?

Now the Russians want a way out. They are haggling with the U.S. over the terms of a staged withdrawal. The U.S. is in the cat­bird seat. We don't have to give up everything because the Soviets badly need to find a way to cut their losses in money, morale, and prestige. We can afford to go further than we shall, plenty because the Russians have no idea how to win the conflict militarily any time soon.

The leader of the puppet regime that is at least nominally running the country, Mr. Najibullah, seems loath to wave goodbye to the estimated 120,000 Soviet troops that now occupy "his" country.
Letters to the Editor—Laatulasitis

Dear Editor: At first I didn't know what was going on. Back when I was a kid school was a good time. I been scattered occurrences going on. Back when I was a kid September. Before this there had remember the Fall of '85; in classes, but they were so few and retrospect first exams were sort of random that they could be at people at the school. Sometimes we even let non-members study with us.

Now there is a first year "law review" study group. Most court is another milestone of law school which I look back on fondly. Sure it was a pain in the ass at time and Mike Hillinger never told me one useful thing, but overall it was an enjoyable learning experience. No big deal, really; they even had to ask some people to continue in order to fill out the tournament. Not this year. No sir, no short- age of players this year, the new law review class took care of that. And fun? About as much as starched boxer shorts, at least that is for the 90% that weren't in on the argument-notes-pool conspiracy. And let's not forget the rumors of scheduling changes so that lovers wouldn't have to argue against each other. Don't these people know that: a two-page resume is gauche?

I said at first I didn't know what was going on, but recently it all came together for me—Laatulasitis! (pronounced: law-tol-aht-lee-tes). How did this inidious infection take root at our fair school? Usually it is confined to prominent national law schools, the kind that everyone at Marshall-Wythe says they wouldn't have gone to even if they had been accepted. However, after little factual inquiry I believe that I have relatively isolated the origin of laatulasitis at Marshall-Wythe.

The first wide-spread incidence of the disease was exhibited by members of the class of 1989; in the fall of last year when they began to form study groups in September. Before this there had been scattered occurrences in prior classes, but they were so few and random that they could be attributed to the individual psychological abnormalities. The disease became rampant within the second-year class last semester, as evidenced by continual attempts to totally dominate classroom discussion. It was shortly after this that the first-year "law review" study group was formed. Of course, this whole time a small group of terminal second-year law review members were quietly toiling away on their most court briefs.

Looking back on it now I should have diagnosed the problem earlier, but it wasn't until a few weeks into this semester that the pieces fell together. First there was the tragic behavior in the most court tournament and then, almost unbelievably, it hit the class of 1989. It came to my attention that someone in my class had actually determined social security numbers and then computed the quality point averages of other students. I knew this sort of behavior was commonplace up north, but the shock finally made me face the facts. Marshall-Wythe appears to be headed for national prominence. All I can say now is that I'm glad I'll be gone before it actually happens.

Now that it has begun there really isn't much we can do. Experts (Steve Fraser) describe the disease as a neurological disorder which blocks the left side of the brain. No definite cure is known, but individuals in advanced stages have shown improvement after substantial peer reconditioning. And there, my friends, lies the twisted irony of this horrid disease. While the only hope for the afflicted is normal societal interaction, the disease is highly contagious, putting anyone who comes in contact with an infected individual in serious danger.

Because of the risks involved everyone will have to decide for themselves what course of action to take. Call me a quitter, but having less than a semester to go, I am going to stay away from the leper colony as much as possible. The class of '90 appears to be generally lost except in certain individual cases. However, it is the first-years that have the most to lose, but they are also in the best position to stop the plague. I wish them luck.

Sincerely, Tom Rohler

3L Longs for Balls

To the Editor: I cannot contain myself any longer.

One day in the jungle a blind rabbit encountered a blind snake. The rabbit said, "Greetings! But how do I know that you actually are a snake?"

"And how can I be sure you are what you tell me you are?", replied the snake.

"Well," said the rabbit, "if you're not satisfied by my word, then why don't you come over here and touch me. Then I'll do the same to you."

"Whatever you say, buddy."

The snake approached the rabbit and began his physical examination. "My, what long, pointy ears you have. And your hind legs are longer than your front legs. Ooh, and you're so fluffy and have such a cute little bushy tail. You must be a rabbit. I believe you."

"But I'm not yet so convinced," said the rabbit. The rabbit then started his tactile inspection of the snake: "Ew, your skin is so, oh, ci-

ly and scaly. Your tongue has a fork in it. You don't seem to have any legs. And you have no balls. You must be a lawyer!"

Well, why do I bring this up? What's the point? Not much, except I'm a second-semester third-year kind of just riding out the end of this long wave to its thundering conclusion: the dreaded bar, the only test that really counts around here anyway.

But I thought you needed amusement considering the recent drub this commercially-oriented paper has printed. In one word, I'll tell you what's missing, though: conviction. No one seems to have "balls" (probably better remembered as "cojones") anymore (except maybe Cap'n Mike "From the Right" Davidson who threatened that if I didn't ex-

luated him from this distinction he'd have a Tomahawk "guided" in my general direction and ruin my guitar and all my tapes and stereo, not to mention my LEEROY mobile).

Therefore, if you choose to re-

pond to this: show some, please.

By the way, I got a chance recently to look at the complaint our almost-forgotten, beloved ex-

professor Bernie Corr filed against W & M, especially naming Dean Sullivan, President Verkuil and Professor vacc. Ooooh, it is nice. Twenty-three pages worth of allegations, a true lesson in civil procedure and constitutional law. Take a look at it sometime.

And remember, as Rodney Dangerfield once said, "It's a jungle out there, so you've got to watch out for Number 1. But don't step in Number 2!" See you at Lidelberg Night.

Not As Conceivably Absent As It Would Like.

Lee "So Sue Me" Bender

P.S. I know I don't look as much like "The Boss" anymore as I us-
ed to. Call me "Chief", instead.

ATLA

Pres.

Continued from Page Four

Perhaps we should be thankful that the SBA spends too much time in inane debate, trivial discussion, and petty high-schoolish squabbles, for were it left to decide matters of real priority on a regular basis, the law school would soon have as much trouble attracting and keeping good students as it seems to have retaining quality faculty.

Ed Shaugnessy

3L

FUN FAX!!

Of the 82 separate Federalist Papers, 51 were written by Alexander Hamilton—including 78, on the topic of the judiciary, the one much discussed by legal folk. Madison wrote 26 of the famous letters to the editor, and John Jay & John Jay was sick for much of the writing.
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Influential Australian Law Professor Alex C. Castles pictured with Dean Sullivan after his lecture last week on "Two Hundred Years of American Influence On the Australian Legal Experience."
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that Corr had failed to meet both the publication and faculty governance tenure criteria.

**Public or Perish**

Corry's complaint takes issue with this finding. It compares his publication record with that of three other faculty members reviewed for tenure in the same period. The complaint charges that Corr was not entitled to the same standard as the other professors, and that if the standard had changed prior to his review, he was not properly notified.

Corry published four law review articles from 1983-85, his probation period. Three related to his specialty, conflicts. In memoranda dated January 3 and February 27, 1986, Sullivan made statements to the effect that the publication standard for Marshall-Wythe is qualitative and that Corr's publication record was high and that, in Corr's words, Corr was not judged on the criteria.

The complaint says that in the same year, another faculty member was granted tenure on the basis of one article. Shortly after Corr was not recommended for tenure, he submitted to another evaluator, who gave it strong praise.

Plagiarism

The complaint levies a charge of plagiarism against a third member of the faculty, who was granted tenure in the same year that Corr was not recommended for tenure. Corr's complaint claims that the publication, the only one made by this faculty member during her probationary period, was based largely on drafts by research assistants who received no credit for the material, although the article included some material copied almost word for word.

The complaint points out that Corr's application for tenure began, and Dean Sullivan concealed it from the other faculty members unaware of that fact. Further, the complaint says that Sullivan tampered with theses materials, December 30, 1987. The defense responded with a memorandum adverse to Corr's tenure application was filed two addenda to its report in August and September 1986. Corr alleges both addenda were in response to letters by Sullivan asking the committee to reconsider the tenure recommendations.

**Procedural Improperies Denied**

Corry's complaint points to a provision in the Procedures for Reten­ tion, Promotion, and Tenure (as revised September 23, 1982) that says faculty members should receive notice of any significant changes in the interpretation of the tenure criteria. He argues that he never received any notice of significant changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The complaint alleges that in the answer filed by the College, Sullivan's conclusion that Corr's tenure application was "seriously flawed" should be reconsidered.

The complaint states that the PRFC consensus was that Sullivan and some of Corr's opponents violated "the Procedures and fundamental concepts of fairness" by inserting adverse and inappropriate information into his tenure record after the file was closed, thereby depriving Corr of his right to due process.

The answer filed by the defendants neither admits nor denies these allegations, but says they are conclusory allegations about the import of an advisory report which speaks for itself and under College policy was solely an advisory recommendation.

Corry claims that the PRFC's report to its in August and October of 1986. Corr alleges both addenda were in response to letters by Sullivan asking the committee to reconsider its conclusions. The complaint argues that, "the selection of the reader and a third member...unanimously reaffirmed the conclusion that Corr's tenure evaluation was not grant or deny tenure "involves consideration of the faculty member's ability to make a significant future contribution to the College and the School of Law. Such a decision necessarily involves speculation about the faculty member's entire professional and academic career in addition to the specific factors emphasized in the College and School of Law policies."

The complaint argues that the selection of the reader and a third member...unanimously reaffirmed the conclusion that Corr's tenure evaluation was not grant or deny tenure "involves consideration of the faculty member's ability to make a significant future contribution to the College and the School of Law. Such a decision necessarily involves speculation about the faculty member's entire professional and academic career in addition to the specific factors emphasized in the College and School of Law policies."

The defense reply notes that the decision whether to grant tenure is under review. Faculty Status Committee voted in favor of awarding Corr tenure, 4-2, with 1 abstention.

July 18, 1986 - PRFC unanimously concludes the law school's evaluation of Corr's tenure application was "seriously flawed" and should be reconsidered. The complaint points to three violations of the Procedures by Sullivan and opponents of Corr's tenure.

October, 1986 - PRFC issues a second addendum. Corr claims: such addendum unanimously affirmed the PRFC's conclusion again in response to questions by Sullivan.

December, 1986 - Provost Schiavelli recommends that Corr be denied tenure.

May 17, 1987 - PRFC unanimously concludes the law school's evaluation of Corr's tenure application was "seriously flawed" and should be reconsidered. The committee points to three violations of the Procedures by Sullivan and opponents of Corr's tenure.

May 17, 1987 - PRFC unanimously concludes the law school's evaluation of Corr's tenure application was "seriously flawed" and should be reconsidered. The committee points to three violations of the Procedures by Sullivan and opponents of Corr's tenure.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.

The answer filed by Sullivan says that the quotations in the memorandum were taken out of context and were not substantial changes in the tenure review requirements when his application was submitted, he should have been notified but was not.
Faculty Replacement Search Continues

by John Fagan

This past fall, the craziest question I was asked during a job interview was, "If you died today what would your tombstone say?" While stumbling through some idiotic answer my fondest wish was to be on the other side of the desk asking this guy why he thought he was on The Dating Game. My wish didn't come true, but this spring eleven students are getting to sit on the comfortable side of the interview as members of the faculty search committee.

The departure of Professors George, Nicol, Edmonds, and Rendleman has necessitated a search for their replacements. The student committee, chaired by Dave Louzer and co-ordinated by Professor Lederer, is but one step in the process. It is, however, a somewhat unusual step. According to committee member Mike Gaertner, none of the candidates who have been interviewed so far has encountered a similar group at any other school.

At present, two offers have been extended and accepted for the upcoming year, although the offer must still be approved by the Board of Visitors (BOV). Vice-Dean Williamson, chairman of the committee, feels that approval is merely a formality as the BOV normally follows the recommendation of the faculty committee. The new faculty members are a husband-and-wife team hired to replace Professors Niehn and George.

The faculty committee considers many factors in deciding whether to recommend the candidates to the BOV. Among the factors considered, according to Dean Williamson, are the school's curriculum needs, the candidates' expertise, and budgetary restraints. "If we lose a junior faculty member we may not be able to replace him or her with a senior member because of the budget," says Williamson. To be recommended, a candidate must receive the votes of two-thirds of the faculty.

Many Factors Considered

The student committee interviews candidates after the faculty. Each is interviewed by a group of four or five students who then make a recommendation of "yes," "yes with reservations," or "no." Although the student committees cannot veto any faculty decision, they do have some input. "It's just a screening process," says Gaertner, "and the weight of our recommendation depends upon how honestly we feel about the candidate and how personally involved we get." The final decision, of course, is made by the BOV after receiving a recommendation from the faculty.

There has been some concern among students that having so many professors leaving at one time is an indication of problems that might damage M-W's reputation. In response to this concern Dean Williamson replied that this sort of turnover is "not atypical." In fact, according to Williamson it is a positive reflection on M-W because "we want to be perceived as having faculty that other schools want on their staffs."

Whatever the reasons for the recent departures of faculty, it can only be hoped that the process outlined above results in the hiring of faculty equal in quality to those who are leaving.

Oral Skill

Continued from Page One

The students had varied experiences with the program and different perceptions of it. Many found positive aspects to the program. Mike McCauliffe, who took first place, said, "The Tournament was good, and fairly well run. The TAs were conscientious and good. The program was really a learning experience and a good speaking experience."

Helen Desaulniers said, "The program is really worthwhile in terms of the education here. Becoming aware of the appellate process is really useful, especially preparing the brief and arguing before Judges who spit questions at you."

Robert Lewandowski, who finished in the top eight generally liked the program and said, "I encouraged people to go through to the end. The competition, the first few times when you are questioned, but then it gets much easier" Hillinger, one of the program's organizers, begins by selecting a topic for the brief. He gets ideas from the advancing fleet. "Usually while reading the advance sheets something jumps out at me. It is a difficult circuit which courts disagree on which the Supreme Court had not yet decided definitively. The brief is the topic came from something the Supreme Court could have decided a year ago but chose not to.

Students write a brief on this topic and turn it in during November. In January, the students participate in the advocacy tournament. Most students must argue at least once, but then they have the option to drop out. Everyone who wins in the tournament has a chance to continue. Also, people who lost but had high scores compete in an elimination round on Monday of the second week. After this round, 64 students remain and advance only by beating their opponents.

Of the top eight, six make the two national moot court teams, and the other two become alternates. The moot court board, a student-run organization, sends out invitations to join the invitation national moot court team. Hillinger noted that this year the board sent out 25 invitations to 32s. To prepare the students for the advocacy part of "App Ad," Hillinger lectured on and showed excerpts of arguments. He also invited Virginia Supreme Court Justice Thomas to give three lectures.

Student Reaction

However, most students agreed that "App Ad" is a grueling process. McCauliffe noted, "oral argument takes two weeks out of the semester just when you are getting geared up for classes." Desaulniers agreed, and added, "job security has a role in the pressure. It's not grueling, like an iron-man triathlon, but it certainly is taxing." She stated that she enjoyed the program, but was lost as to how to do now. Lewandowski found the work hard. "It is a real discipline problem to write out the brief," he said.

On specific aspects of this year's program, students varied. With regard to the use of partners, some students had problems generally from one partner riding on the back of another. But McCauliffe thought the team concept was good, "for some it was not a success, but people made their own choice (of partners)." Desaulniers found that the partners idea had pros and cons. "You could talk with a person and bounce ideas off them. We did a lot of work with other people. It helped develop strategy. But arguing two issues when you only prepared one was difficult," she said. Lewandowski said the team concept was a really good idea. People could choose not to have a partner, but I really encouraged people to work together.

The judges also created concern. McCauliffe thought the judges did an outstanding job. Among the earlier judges, however, "The interest was good idea and they seemed to lack depth." However, Lewandowski said the judges were good, including the student judges.

Hillinger's partial absence was important. The effect on students' perceptions. McCauliffe said, "It was an obvious drawback because there were all of the time. However, the topic was a good, tight topic, and this mitigated the decreased availability." Desaulniers said, "this year was unfortunate because there were not as many judges always available." But Lewandowski did not feel the same. "I had no handouts without the professor," he said.

The students agreed that Justice Thomas's talks were informative, helpful, and gave a real-life perspective to the class.

Changes

Several suggestions for change came up. Judges should be better screened. The brief and argument could be done the same semester to aid familiarity with the material. One student suggested that more TAs would help. The class, it was suggested, could easily be worth three hours of credit. Also, the communication procedures needed to be altered so that class changes and meetings would be set over the phone in advance and by everyone.

Hillinger is considering only one possible change, the partners system. "The chief advantages are that you can talk with someone without violating the honor code, the team is much more like real-life law practice, and often the finals of the Judge the brief is better," he noted. He saw the major disadvantage as personality conflicts.

Overall, the students interviewed seemed to feel that the program was important. One student had special importance here, they said, because many other schools do not teach it or have it purely as a voluntary class. McCauliffe said, "It was pretty intense, but a good learning experience for all of us." It is probably a good thing in hindsight," said Desaulniers.

From the TAs perspective, the program was important. "The second years were really gang ho, and the ones in the last week of competition were really good," said Sue Stoney, a 3L. "App Ad" TA, Sue did express reservations about the partners system. But she said the judges were good. She said the TAs also had a busy workload, because they had to take care of many administrative details and do letters to judges manually.

Which Bar Review Doesn't Charge Extra For Its Extras?

Kaplan-SMHI Bar Review Services includes a comprehensive Multistate Question Volume, 18 hours of in-class Multistate Question analysis, 2 practice exams, and a Diagnostic Analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses, all woven into an integrated review course at no extra charge.

A certain bar review course which charges an extra $95 to $225 for its "multistate workshop," Kaplan-SMHI Bar Review Services which includes a comprehensive Multistate Question Volume, 18 hours of in-class Multistate Question analysis, 2 practice exams, and a Diagnostic Analysis to identify strengths and weaknesses, all woven into an integrated review course at no extra charge.
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BENCH CLASSICS

UTAH STATE Prison inmate Oliver Benjamin Gerrish apparently wanted to make sure the U.S. District Court in Salt Lake City understood he was serious when he accused corrections officials of not giving him enough paper for his legal motions.

So, carefully written on five squares of single-ply toilet tissue, Mr. Gerrish made his point.

"Plaintiff apologizes for using toilet paper herein," it reads, "but it is all the paper he has available now." Mr. Gerrish's "Motion to Seek an Injunction in Order to Obtain Adequate Supplies for Access to Courts" arrived in a prison envelope and was duly processed by the federal court clerk's office.

"I stamped it as carefully as I could," says Deputy Court Clerk Theresa Brown.

---

BOXED BRIEFS

Mary & William Society Sponsors Programs

The Mary and William Law Society is sponsoring two programs on women and employment this week. On February 23, Abbe Gordon, federal court clerk's office, will present "The Mary and William Law Society: A Panel Discussion on Women and Employment." The program will be held at 4:30 p.m. in Room 124 of the law school.

On Thursday, February 25, Dr. Jeanne Wythe in 1977 and has been with Hunton & Williams since April 1977. She is the author of a chapter in "Women's Law" and has been with Hunton & Williams since April 1977. She is the author of a chapter in "Women's Law" and has been with Hunton & Williams since April 1977. She is the author of a chapter in "Women's Law" and has been with Hunton & Williams since April 1977. She is the author of a chapter in "Women's Law" and has been with Hunton & Williams since April 1977.

Wythe will address "How to Cope With the Old Boy Network" in law-firm practice. If you have ever wondered how prevalent the old-boy network is and how you can live with it in large-firm practice, this will be an enlightening program. Professors Butler, George, Barnard, Laidbetter, and Hillinger will participate. There will be a small reception in the student lounge afterward.

Smoking Ban

The SBA is considering a proposal to ban smoking in the law school. Second-year representative Jeff Lowe is chair to the committee which will poll the student body on the subject. Students with opinions on the matter should contact their SBA representatives.

Law Students for Auction

If Valentine's Day doesn't live up to your expectations, try the "Dinner and Dance Auction" Sponsored by Law Students Involved in the Community. Students can bid on a fabulous date with a law student. Dates include lunch or dinner for two at area restaurants such as the Whaling company, Sakura, and the Green Leaf. The auction will be held Thursday, February 18 at 8:00 pm at Trinkle Hall, Campus Center. A $1.00 admission will be applied to successful bids. Proceeds will go the Public Interest Fund.

---

Williams' Recovery

Professor Walter Williams is presently recuperating from an operation for removal of a cancerous tumor in his stomach. We all wish him a speedy recovery.

---

Fair Notice

If you are interested in taking either the New York or Pennsylvania Bar Exam in Richmond this summer, please see Dean Kaplan or leave a note in Red Eves' or Susan Caughlan's hanging file.

ENTERTAINMENT & SPORTS LAW PANEL

On Tuesday, February 23 there will be a panel discussion on careers in entertainment & sports law. Practitioners in the field will be on hand to talk about their work, as well as share tips on how to get your foot in the door of these highly competitive fields. The panel begins at 1:15 in room 128. A reception in the student lounge will follow the formal discussion.

NALP APARTMENT EXCHANGE

Forms for the April 1 edition of the NALP apartment exchange are due in the Office of Career Planning & Replacement by 5:00, Wednesday, Feb. 24. A form must be filled out to submit your Williamsburg apartment or to sublet an apartment in another location for the summer.

SECOND ANNUAL PLATINUM PLUNGER AWARDS

It's not too late to submit your rejection letters for the Second Annual Platinum Plunger awards. Submit entries to Linda or Dean Kaplan.

F.B.I. INFORMATION SESSION

On Friday, February 26, Special Agent Joseph O'Brien will give a talk on careers with the F.B.I. All interested students are encouraged to attend. The talk will begin at 1:00 in room 124.

---

The Advocate FIRST ANNUAL BRUSH WITH FAME CONTEST

HAVE YOU BRUSHED WITH FAME?*

*If you have, we can cure you.

Ever met/dated/stood in the same zip code as a celebrity/VIP/guy who got his face on a Wheaties box?

If so, enter the Advocate's "Brush With Fame" Contest. If not, make something up and enter anyway. Write down your name, the name of the famous person, and a brief description of the famous encounter and slip it into the submissions envelope on the Advocate office door, Room 250.

Winners will have their entries published and will receive an autographed photo of megastar Pat Sejak, host of Wheel of Fortune, and a free issue of the Advocate autographed by Jeff Yeats.

Sample entries are:

"Al Jareau asked me back to his hotel room after a show." (Cheri Lewis)

"Richard Allen urinated next to me on Capitol Hill." (Steven Mulroy)

"I rode an elevator with Henry Kissinger." (Bruce McDougall)

Enter early and enter often.

---

The Advocate
Letters Cont'd
Camel's Nose

Editor,

Do I detect the not-so-subtle rustle of the camel's nose gliding in under the edge of the tent? Your editorial on Unborn's Rights (Right to Life Expanded III, January) suggested a right (enforceable by the police powers of the state) of the unborn to be protected from every potential harm, ranging from drugs and alcohol to unhealthy food and stress! No matter how attractive this may be emotionally, you have simply started on a bad road going the wrong direction and reached an untenable position.

Is every sympathetic complainant to have a new cause of action tailored specifically for him? Your approach is particularly dangerous for two reasons:

On absolute grounds, the government has no business meddling with the personal rights of women to their own bodies and decisions concerning them. Until the new constituent is presented, kicking and screaming, to the world, the very hard and heart-wrenching decisions can only be made by the prospective mother based on the cold reality that an unwanted child is better off never being born in the first place.

Secondly, presuming that the mother decides to have her baby, the proposed extension of regulatory power to include monitoring of the fetal environment is a slippery precedent which is just too dangerous to contemplate. Where will it end? When has a bureaucrat ever passed up the opportunity to regulate anything? What is to stop well-meaning busybodies or malign master-racists from controlling every corner of life? Entire volumes of guidelines for proto-plasmic custody will sprout up:

Expectant mothers will be forbidden to live in certain areas in which hazardous substances are above EPA limits in the air or water. Couples will be forbidden to wed on the basis of screenings for such disorders as Tay Sachs or Sickle Cell Trait.

Now, make a small logical extension, and consider that ANY piece of potentially useful tissue could be held to have an independent right to a pure environment, with the concomitant power of the government to regulate and enforce implied thereby. The fetus and the kidney are nourished by the same bloodstream:

Alcohol is illegal because someone might need your liver. Smoking is illegal because someone may need a lung transplant.

Contact lenses and radial keratotomies damage valuable corneas. Salt is rationed because it is bad for a potentially transplantable heart.

Attempted suicide by violent means is a crime against the state because a success might render certain anatomical parts unusable.

It can happen. The Commerce Clause is a tool already fashioned for the job. Anything can be declared a commodity by a willing, compliant, or willless legislature.

Jonathan S. Hudson
1L's Air Legal Writing Concerns

by Karin Horwatt

Anybody who has been within shouting distance of a 1L must be aware of first-year complaints about the legal writing program. Most second- and third-year professors have heard their own 1Ls complain, but the seriousness of first-year objections was exacerbated by Professor Michael Hillinger's absence last semester to teach at Emory. The complaints filtered back up through the teacher evaluation system and the grapevine, to the professor himself. Hillinger said that the legal research and writing class is going to be changed, and suggestions from SBA meeting will be rooted in the administration for consideration.

About twenty students attended the gathering, which was held beforehand at Barnard's Civil Procedure class. The complaints fell into three categories: complaints with the apparent confusion and disorganization of the course, with the perceived harshness and rigidity with which the Honor System is applied, and with problems surrounding the memo. People seemed insulted at the format, which was an imperfect attempt to teach adult skills. This person suggested that the instructor should give skill objectives early in the course and "show students what the product should look like." People agreed with this assessment. "Show me a slide of a book doesn't help me," someone else said. "I felt like I'm in a void," was another comment. People also expressed disbelief that some of the sessions would be taught by someone who was inaccessible. People felt that, since there are days when legal writing does not meet as scheduled, those days would be better spent learning how to use the library.

If any consensus at all was expressed at the SBA meeting, and if there is one recurrent theme to the complaints made outside this memorandum meeting, it is that many first-year students would wish they could do more memos. Someone at the SBA meeting suggested that two or three memos be assigned, and someone else suggested that the closed memo be assigned earlier in the semester. A third individual suggested that writing assignments be paired with bibliography assignments in increasing complexity. Another student objected to the fact that there was never an "ideal" memo put on file. People expressed anger that the comments on their closed memos were so negative and felt that they were not told what was expected of them in the first place. Others stated that when information was provided, it proved concretely, for example, the memo in the assigned text, Clear and Effective Legal Writing, does not conform to Hillinger's requirements.

In addition, there were specific complaints surrounding this semester's open memo, problems which could have been avoided. One jurisdiction contained a case identical to the fact pattern, necessitating a change in jurisdiction after the memo had been assigned and after many people had begun their research. The jurisdiction had to be changed, and the people in those sections received a ten day extension. Another jurisdiction was complicated because of a dual court system (the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals is the criminal equivalent of the Texas Supreme Court—but only after 1981, and there is also a dual intermediate appellate level system), a city (Houston) that is divided into 1st and the 14th districts, and a code that is undergoing revision. The facts about the Texas jurisdiction were brought out by a 1L who worked in a Houston law firm. There were first years who said they had no complaints. "I didn't expect to be coddled or have my hand held," someone wrote. The objections were discussed in a long interview with Professor Hillinger. He prefaced the interview by saying, "I do not wish to minimize your frustration," and expressed empathy with the perennial first-year confusion syndrome. He volunteered that he regretted his decision to teach at Emory, during which time, he said, "my work here [at Marshall-Wythe] was essentially pro bono." He said, "I will never do that again," and that at the time, it seemed like "the best solution to a difficult problem." But regarding the closed memo, he said, "you name it, we've tried it." In response to the two or three memo suggestions, he said, "You will go down as a unique class, one that says 'Beat us some more.'"

At Emory, he said, they are assigned an open memo and a closed memo in the fall. He said his impression was that students found it a strain—particularly since the second memo runs into mid-term exams. "The ideal way," Hillinger said, "to teach writing is in small groups. With a class of a hundred and eighty, there is a limit to how many memos you can ask them to do. "Each person would be able to talk to people at length about each piece of writing, but I spend an average of thirty minutes with each student [in discussing memos], and [with a class of 180] that's ninety hours." But he expressed surprise at student frustration surrounding the memos. "As a whole, the memos were better than in previous years [in the sense that the worst memos of the class were less bad than the worst memos in previous years, and the best ones were better]." Furthermore, he said that the people who came to talk to him about their memos were on the right track.

Hillinger confirmed Riley's statement that the curriculum was undergoing revision, but preferred not to comment upon those revisions because they are only at the planning stage and no formal proposals have been drawn up.

('This article was written by a first year student.)

A Visit With Uncle Bill

by Tad Pethybridge

Relaxed, well-spoken, and nattily dressed, Chief Justice Rehnquist addressed a capacity crowd of law students and faculty on January 27 at Millington Hall. Unaffected to the point of hopping up on the lab table behind him, the Chief Justice gave a casual talk designed to give some insight into what the Chief Justice called the "cycle of a Supreme Court Justice's life," although he noted that "it's kind of like being a law student: you can't really know what it's like unless you do it."

Chief Justice Rehnquist began his program with a brief overview of the course of a Supreme Court session. He explained the Court's procedures for handling the 4,000-5,000 petitions for certiorari the Court receives annually, the process of choosing and hearing the cases that are argued before the Court, and the procedures in which the Justices vote to decide the cases. The conferences are conducted with absolute confidence that if someone knocks at the door, all discussion stops and the junior Justice is sent to open the door and handle the interruption. The Chief Justice said that this duty falls to the junior Justice "because he's the least important person in the room—at least for purposes of answering the door."

The Chief Justice then held an extensive question and answer session that proved to be more entertaining than educational. Rehnquist's charm and humor showed clearly even while evading tough substantive law questions. Several times when questions referred to cases by name the Chief Justice had to be reminded of the facts, leading him to remark, "When I was your age I had a good memory, too."

The remark was fitting, for although it is unlikely that any memory of the facts obscured a brilliant insight from the Chief Justice's appearance, most memory of the occasion will be belying that the Chief Justice had provided them with an entertaining afternoon and a good memory.

BEYOND 9 TO 5

The need for fast, quality copies doesn't stop at 5 o'clock. And neither do we. Kinko's is open early, open late, and open weekends to take care of all of your copying needs.

513 Prince George Street

Behind Sorority Court

kinko's

Great copies. Great people.
W & M Fund Launches Pledge Drive

The William & Mary Public Service Fund embarks on a major new fundraising effort this spring. The organization, which has raised over $4000 through the Lounge-a-thon, donut sales, T-shirt sales, and matching contributions from the Dean, will initiate a school-wide pledge drive sometime this semester. The Fund helps fellows and M-W students to afford to pursue legal careers in the public interest.

Under the pledge drive plan, which has been used at 26 other law schools, students will be asked to pledge a certain portion of this summer’s salary to the Fund. Students can choose to designate a flat percentage, anywhere from 0.5% to 10%, or contribute the equivalent of one day’s salary. In the past, such drives have raised over $25,000 in a single year. Fund members estimate the allotment per recipient to be about $2000 per year.

Kathy Hessler, one of the founders of the Fund, considered the contributions the responsibility of all law students. "Just as our legal training begins before we start in our professions," Hessler wrote to the Advocate, "so does our duty to improve society through our chosen profession."

"While there is nothing wrong with making money," Hessler continued, "students have a duty to pay back "the society which provides us the...benefits of advancement."

The Fund is currently run by a Board of Volunteers. Permanent Board members will be elected on Monday, February 22, 1988. The Honor Council will administer the election. The positions to be elected are: second year co-chair, first year co-chair, 2 second year representatives, and 2 first year representatives. The Board, once elected, will select a secretary and treasurer.

Candidacy forms are available in the W&M office. Interested persons can contact Hessler, Fern Lavalle, Amy Cook, Peter Portzer, Neal McKinnon or Mike Clancy for further information.

Student Suits, Cont’d

The unnecessary extra costs the insurance company incurred will be passed on to you and me as insureds, and especially the driver of the other car who ended up having the claim against her policy costing over twice what it should have, thereby most probably unfairly increasing her rates by a margin greater than it should have been.

The insurance company thought Fern was simply a student-they did not know he was actually a law student. "They had the distinct sense that because of my financial disadvantage as a student that they could string me along and perhaps settle the case for far below its actual cost," said Fern. "But they didn't know who they were dealing with." In sum, said Fern, "I was a lot hungrier than they were. I couldn't afford to lose this case, and my single most important asset- my car."

The bottom line is don't be afraid to use your law school education to defend your rights. Stand up to the schmucks and sue 'em.

Master of Laws
Boston University
School of Law

LL.M. Degree in Banking Law Studies

A unique graduate program offering separate, multidisciplinary courses of study in American Banking Law Studies and in International Banking Law Studies.

Taught by faculty of the Boston University School of Law, eminent banking law attorneys and management experts, these innovative programs provide an exceptional blend of intellectual and practical education at one of the nation's most prestigious law schools. Covering the full range of advanced banking law subjects, the curriculum also includes courses specially developed to introduce lawyers to the economic and managerial aspects of the domestic and international financial services industry.

This comprehensive LL.M. program offers a singular educational opportunity for lawyers who wish to practice in these dynamic, fast growing areas of specialization.

Applications are now being accepted for full or part-time enrollment in September 1988.

For a catalog containing detailed information and application forms, write:
Graduate Program in Banking Law Studies
Martin Center for Banking Law Studies
Boston University School of Law
705 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
or call: 617-353-3023

IM BB Roundup

The Dipsomaniacs opened their season last week in a impressive 45-35 win over Mr. Rai's Neighborhood. The Dips never trailed and won rather hardly. As one spectator put it, "They are a nature squad." The Dips were led in the victory by Jim Lady's team high of 12 points. Mark "Brambo" Bramble added as many of the squad contributed. The Dips were low-league winners last year under the name The Knoes.

Speaking Sports

by Larry Schimms

Well, another Superbowl is history. I must say that I enjoyed the party more than the actual game, and all the few Superbowls have been particularly boring unless you're into ham­tie with the winners. Besides, Mr. Yeats does throw a great party whatever the occasion.

Several people, if I dare call Redskins fans that, have chided me for my prediction on the final score. At my favorite sports bar, picking the outcome of football games is a whole lot like playing Russian Roulette: you will lose, it's only a question of when. As a saving grace, however, what I said would be the keys to the game. I merely made a harmless error. I have to say that the Redskins deserved to win. They did everything right and had a brilliant day from Tim Smith and Doug Williams. Back in August, who would have thought that those two would clinch a Superbowl win?

The weekend was a big one for my hometown with all the festivities associated with the NBA All-Star Game. I generally don't care much for the All-Star game (it resembles more of a playground on the South Side rather than an organized game), but this year's game was fun to watch because it only served to demonstrate something that Chicago fans have known for some time. Namely, there is not a more valuable player than the kid from U.N.C. This is Michael Jordan's year. I only wish the Bulls as a team were good enough to make it to the finals. Someday they might; we can only wait. By the way, Michael did deserve to win the slam dunk contest. I'd like to see you take off from the free-throw line and slam with your head still above the rim.

The sad part about the passing of the Superbowl is that now we enter a definite hole in professional sports. Sure we have pro hockey and basketball games, but nothing of any significance. The hockey season is eighty games long to eliminate four teams, and basketball is even worse. The mar-a-tennis and golf events are still one or two months off. It's too cold to think about spring training, and no one cares much about indoor soccer, even soccer fans. I suppose I could watch professional bowling, but that's not necessarily one of the all-time great spectator sports. I think the February둡드루m is why God invented college hoops.

This year is different, of course, because of the Olympics. I think the US doesn't do as well as in the summer games. Hopefully the US will have the great Uecker. Also on the team this year is an acquaintance of mine. She is Nancy Sweder-Peltz, a speed skater and an alumna of Wheaton. She is in her fourth year and I don't know for sure. She is not as good a friend of mine as Chuck Long.

In honor of the Olympic year I think we should have our own Marshall-Wythe games. Different law students have shown exceptional skills in several areas this year which would make good contests. For instance, there is the Marathon Dance Session to Little Fost while wearing hats belonging to a wassail of the seat savants. A new twist to the skill and a fashion coup at the same time is the dressing of lampshades. Jeff, what was in that beer?

Another game gaining populari­ty this fall was the Twenty-Yard Nute Dash through the lobby. I won't name names but someone in us would look better doing it than others.

One of my favorite tests of skill has to be the Fajita Wraper Toss. The wrapper is tossed from a moving vehicle while at the same time avoiding one of Williamson's finest. This is obviously a team sport but it takes one person to operate the vehicle and another to actually toss the wrapper, similar to the two-man bobsled. Before you try this game remember one important rule: on­ly the driver should carry identification.

If you know of any other tests of skill we should incorporate into our games or games like it, I can't think of everything. As I finalize, I owe a great thanks to Cathy Stan­ton for graciously coming up with my column title only hours before deadline. If you've ever been in journalism you'd know what that was like.

Speaking Sports

Thursday, February 11, 1988