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Recent National Jurist Article Inaccurate, Says Dean Feerick

by Jeffrey Jackson (’96)

A recent article printed in the National Jurist entitled “New York law profs are highest paid,” which stated that Fordham University law professors are paid the highest base salary of all American law schools, is “incorrect,” says Dean John D. Feerick. According to page 10 of the April/May 1996 issue of the National Jurist, Fordham law professors have a base salary of $142,688, the highest in the nation, followed by Harvard Law at $137,129 and NYU Law at $131,830. Other rankings include Hofstra and Brooklyn Law Schools, ranking 18th and 5th in salaries, respectively, and St. John’s School of Law ranking 13th in the country with respect to salaries.

According to the article, these figures were part of a report cited in court documents related to litigation by Massachusetts School of Law’s lawsuit against the America Bar Association over accreditation standards, in which the ABA agreed to cease “considering base salaries as a factor in law school accreditation.”

However, according to Feerick, who has been the Dean at Fordham for almost 14 years, the article is inaccurate on many levels. First, the court document cited in the article was not prepared by the American Bar Association, according to Dean White, the Consultant to Legal Education of the ABA. Pursuant to a recent consent decree, the American Bar Association is no longer allowed to collect salary information and distribute it in such a manner. Second, Dean Feerick notes a crucial but obviously overlooked distinction between “full professors” and full-time faculty. Feerick believes that the figure cited in the article represents the salary for “full professors,” those who have taught at Fordham for an average of about 25 years, not full time professors, defined as those who teach at Fordham on a full time basis. The actual average salary for full-time professors is between $118,000 and $119,000, says Feerick. Another possible source of the discrepancy comes from defining “base salary” as opposed to “compensation.” If a school reports its total compensation as its base salary, that might include benefits such as subsidized housing and tuition assistance for children attending private schools. Fordham includes pension and insurance benefits as part of its base salary.

Feerick also told The Advocate that he was concerned about the inaccurate figure because “As much as you want to be at the top in something, you want to be right.” Feerick mentioned that several students have approached different faculty members and inquired about the article. Some professors who were approached responded “Well, I don’t know where the money comes from.” Feerick also said that some younger members of the faculty were somewhat upset by the article. Feerick also feels that the article created a “distraction and distortion” within the law school. On law school continued on page 10

White, J.; Chief Justice of the Kaufman Securities Law Moot Court Competition

by Charles Caldarola

“Oyez, oyez ... this Court is now in session.”

With these words Suzanne Endrizzi began the final round of the Twenty-First Annual Irving R. Kaufman Memorial Securities Law Moot Court Competition. The near capacity crowd at McNally Amphitheater stood as the distinguished panel of judges entered: “The Honorable Byron White, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court from 1962-1993; the Honorable Nathaniel R. Jones, currently seated on the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit; the Honorable Frank H. Easterbrook, currently seated on the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; and the Honorable Joseph M. McLaughlin, a Fordham Law School Alumnus, currently seated on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.”

The winners of the competition, Heidi Lawson and Chuck Geitner, came from Stetson University School of Law. Ms. Lawson was selected as the Best Speaker. Emory University School of Law, represented by Carlos Kelly and George Ong, was the runner-up team. The Best Brief Award was given to Suffolk University School of Law, represented by David Bohan, Christopher Drinan and Roger Holmes.

The competition presented two questions to be determined: 1) Whether under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“SEAA”), a plaintiff must show that the defendant’s domicile conduct directly caused the plaintiff’s losses in order to establish subject matter jurisdiction. 2) Whether §20(a) of the SEAA requires a plaintiff to establish that the defendant was a culpable participant in the fraudulent transaction.

The facts of this case centered around a fraud committed by a limited partnership in a foreign country known by one of the controlling persons of the corporate general partner. Suit was brought against the surviving controlling persons, who had been told of the fraud after the commencement of the venture by their late partner, who then committed suicide.

The petitioners in this case, the
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The Advocate
To the Editor:

I do not agree with the punishment James Killen received for doodling on Valerie White’s calendar.

The punishment, indeed the whole incident, is a clear example of the type of politically correct hypersensitivity that has produced a racial and ethnic double standard in too many of America’s institutions.

I think some people involved in this ridiculously overblown affair need to just chill out and relax. In my opinion, most Americans are sick and tired of absurd notions like the one that resulted in James’ punishment. The last time I heard someone had to do that was in 6th grade. I’m surprised he didn’t also have to write a thousand times on the blackboard, “I will not face calendars.”

The point here is that such hyper-sensitive political correctness is not good for race relations. It builds walls between us. These walls destroy open, honest and candid discussion concerning race and ethnicity. When people are given ridiculous punishments for scribbling on calendars that happen to feature certain prominent scientists, people will be afraid to express there views on racial issues in other contexts for fear of being labeled racist.”

Furthermore, when people cry racism” in situations such as this (i.e., wanting the doodler expelled and handing down a punishment which greatly outweighs the crime), then the term loses its punch- people become desensitized to it. It is like crying wolf- when an incident occurs that truly warrants the term racist,” people may not fully appreciate the gravity of the matter.

In my opinion, what happened here was either a simple trespass to channel or conversion, together with a great example of de unum non cura le. It was not even close to being a racist act. James should have been required to either buy Valerie a new calendar, or give her the money for the cost of the one he doodled on, nothing more, nothing less.

Jerry Clark
Second Year Law Student

A LETTER TO STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

As a first year student I am willing to admit that I don’t know even a majority of the teachers here. But from what I’ve witnessed thus far, I’m ready to hurl myself from the top of the ivory tower. Perhaps its just my background getting in the way, having had mostly wonderful teachers in my several years of higher education. Maybe I’m just not aware that most academic institutions are very like high school with a power dynamic that leaves students mute and teachers billed as the supreme subjects-supposed to know who see no reason to actually grow as educators by learning from their students.

But then I make the mistake of viewing this experience as an academic one when really its closer to a vocational training institute. I feel like I’m in trucking school and I’m just paying the money to learn how to stay awake and collect my license at the end of it all. I’ve given up on the hope that teachers would ever encourage critical thinking or that most students are wondering anything more vital about the law than what’s going to be on the exam. But I cannot seem to let go of this sad thought that one needs no more than an IA to teach law. Let’s please pretend it’s a real doctorate, I think we all know better. It’s a license, not a degree.

Can you really call this an academic environment of educational enrichment when a torts teacher drones on from the same script for at least ten years without changing thing? My gosh, she’s got to get over herself to death, much less us. Or a Con Law professor who tells one student that he’s just asked the stupidest question ever, another that he really belongs at Cardozo, and to top it all off, as if anyone dare speak against him—snarks and waves off a student’s raised hand and crosses to the other side of the room? Dam those pesky students Always asking questions...don’t they know their place? They do now professor. No one could fail to read the message that this professor likes nothing so much as the sound of his own voice. (I probably wouldn’t laugh at Atilla the Hun’s jokes either...) Then there’s property, a nightmare so atrocious I can’t even bring myself to go into the laundry list of broken classes. Suffice to say, memos every week in a form and style that directly contradict everything the legal writing program holds dear. And I know how much we all love a certain Criminal professor, I love her too but let me ask this: when it comes time for me to defend my client, is someone going to hide the NY Penal Code from me? Are we 90 incapable of thinking though the law, which requires one know about it, that we simply must memorize the statutes? Memorize and regurgitate, high school.

Maybe all the lawyers I talk to are right- just do your thing and escape with your soul. They laugh at me when I tell them I expected intellectual debate. They also tell me to stop worrying about what I see as a disgraceful pedagogical environment, because I lack the power to effect change. Well, I realize students aren’t given any power in fact I don’t even know what the SBA does except throw away beer parties at sports bars. But isn’t it our responsibility to watch out for each other and to do what we can to change things we see are wrong for future students? I certainly wish the students who came before us cared more.

Call me sensitive, but I think it’s inappropriate for teachers to be nasty and dismissive to students, and worse still that students find it funny. Despite the institution’s implicit encouragement that students be selfish, perhaps we could begin to rise above it and demand more of our education.

I think we should demand teachers who will teach. We should either educate, or pressure the administration to get rid of those who don’t seem to like students very much at their worst, and only slightly less loathsome, simply don’t appreciate the importance of student-teacher dynamics enough to see that respecting your students will usually earn you respect as a teacher. Our teachers should stop confusing forced nomenclature with respect. They should see that negative reinforcement doesn’t work, and that a willingness to grow and learn as an educator is essential. These are simple concepts somehow eluding some of them. For those professors who do contemplate these things and understand what it means to teach, thank you. Now could you please talk to your colleagues for us, because ‘we don’t get it’. Somewhere along the way they just forgot that they need us.

Editor’s note: This letter was submitted anonymously and does not reflect the views of The Advocate.
Bethany Cartledge
In-line skater.
T-ball slugger.
Drunk driving victim.
January 18, 1994
Cheraw, SC

If you don't stop someone from driving drunk, who will? Do whatever it takes.

FRIENDS DON'T LET FRIENDS DRIVE DRUNK.
**AS OF 4/4/96**

NEW YORK SUMMER 1996 LOCATION INFORMATION

(ALL LOCATIONS BEGIN 5/29 & ARE VIDEO UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location Details</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBANY</td>
<td>Albany Law School (Begins 5/28)</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANN ARBOR, MI</td>
<td>Univ. of Michigan Law School (Begins 6/3)</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA, GA</td>
<td>Southern College of Technology - Student Center - Marietta</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTIN, TX</td>
<td>Univ. of Texas - Tarlton Law Library</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERKELEY, CA</td>
<td>International House</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON, MA</td>
<td>Boston Univ. School of Law</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKLYN</td>
<td>Brooklyn Law School</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUFFALO</td>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo School of Law</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGE, MA</td>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMDEN, NJ</td>
<td>Rutgers Univ. Campus Center - North Cafeteria</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTEVILLE, VA</td>
<td>Omni Charlotteville Hotel (Begins 5/28)</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHICAGO, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) HYDE PARK</td>
<td>Univ. of Chicago Law School</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) GOLD COAST</td>
<td>Northwestern Law School</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCORD, NH</td>
<td>Franklin Pierce Law Center</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURHAM, NC</td>
<td>Duke Univ. - School of the Environment</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMDEN, CT</td>
<td>Quinnipiac College School of Law</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARTFORD, CT</td>
<td>Univ. of Hartford - Gray Conference Center</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMPSTEAD</td>
<td>Hofstra Univ. School of Law</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITHACA</td>
<td>Cornell Law School</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES, CA</td>
<td>BAR/BRI Office - 3280 Motor Avenue</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANHATTAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) DOWNTOWN</td>
<td>NYU Law School</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) MIDTOWN</td>
<td>A - Eastside - Loews New York Hotel - 569 Lex. Ave. (at 51st St.)</td>
<td>6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B - Westside -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Town Hall - 43rd St. (bet. 6th Ave. &amp; B'way) (Begins 5/22)</td>
<td>9:30AM (LIVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) BAR/BRI Lecture Hall - 1500 B'way (at 43rd St.)</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) UPTOWN</td>
<td>Columbia Univ. - Altschul Aud. (117th St. &amp; Amater.) (Begins 5/28)</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) WALL STREET AREA</td>
<td>Marriott Financial Center - 85 West Street</td>
<td>6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI, FL</td>
<td>BAR/BRI Office - 1570 Madruga Ave, Coral Gables</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTMOUTH CTY, NJ</td>
<td>Holiday Inn - 700 Hope Road - Tinton Falls</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTREAL, CAN.</td>
<td>McGill Univ. - Old Chancellor Day Hall</td>
<td>9AM, 9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWARK, NJ</td>
<td>Rutgers Univ. Law School (Begins 5/28)</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAVEN, CT</td>
<td>Colony Inn - 1157 Chapel Street</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ORLEANS, LA</td>
<td>Tulane Law School</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWTON, MA</td>
<td>Boston College Law School</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALO ALTO, CA</td>
<td>Stanford Law School</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILADELPHIA, PA</td>
<td>Sheridan Univ. City - 36th &amp; Chestnut</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PITTSBURGH, PA</td>
<td>Univ. of Pittsburgh School of Law</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POUGHKEEPSIE</td>
<td>Vassar College</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEENS COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) FLUSHING</td>
<td>CUNY Law School</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) JAMAICA</td>
<td>St. John's Univ. Law School</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCHESTER</td>
<td>Days Inn Downtown - 384 East Avenue</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKLAND COUNTY</td>
<td>Nanuet Inn - 260 West Route 59</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO. ROYALTON, VT</td>
<td>Vermont Law School</td>
<td>1:30PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGFIELD, MA</td>
<td>WNEC School of Law</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEN ISLAND</td>
<td>Wagner College</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFOLK COUNTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) HUNTINGTON</td>
<td>Touro College of Law</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) RIVERHEAD</td>
<td>Ramada East End - 1830 Route 25</td>
<td>9AM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE</td>
<td>Syracuse Univ. College of Law</td>
<td>9AM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORONTO, CAN.</td>
<td>Ontario Driving Training Center - 20 Eglinton Ave. East</td>
<td>9AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON, DC</td>
<td>GW Law School (Begins 5/30)</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE PLAINS</td>
<td>Pace Univ. - Hayes Theatre</td>
<td>9AM/1:30PM/6PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
last month, the Fordham men's hoop team swept through the Western New England College of Law basketball tournament, winning six straight games, the tournament title and commemorative t-shirts in less than 40 hours.

Fordham rolled past its first three opponents, outscoring its foes by an average of some 27 points per game. Fordham entered the quarterfinals as the tournament's number one seed. The Fordham machine was humming.

In the quarterfinals, Fordham's third game of the day, Fordham met a pesky Albany squad who played good team basketball, moved well on offense and made open shots. The Albany team, however, had correctly assessed its team's chances when it planned to spend Saturday evening in Boston. In the second half, Fordham played its up-tempo offensive style and defeated Albany by 18 points.

In the semifinals on Sunday morning, Fordham awoke to play its fifth college-length game of the tournament. Walking in to the gym, one team member spotted andewooded a clearly lost bottle of Flex-All 454. Since its what-pro-trainers use, we used it too, until a nice gentleman came over and asked for it back.

Fordham's opponent in the semi's, Quinipiac Law School, was a tough, determined team. Fordham was down by 10 with nine minutes remaining as Quinipiac ate up the clock. However, when the lights in the gym went out with 3:40 left in the game, Fordham was up by six and was able to hold on for the win.

In the finals, Fordham played a second team from Albany Law School. The game was tied with ten minutes left. With a minute and a half left, on the back end of a one-and-one, one of the referees, a skinny, lean man, began questioning about evidentiary rules. By that time, however, Fordham was up by about twelve and the game ended without further legal chatter. Fordham had won the tournament.

The members of the team's 15 members made the trip to Springfield, Massachusettstournament. In no particular order, they are as follows: Will Shih (3D), an annoyingly quick guard who manages both to foul the other team and travel with the ball without being caught. Lorrin Forrest (1D), a 6'4" product of Queens College who had a thunderous dunk off of a fast-break. Loren also wins best dressed for his matching suspenders-based outfit. Paul Hessler (3D), Mr. Loose Ball, the team's catalyst in the final game with six quick points at the start of the second half. John P. Doherity (3D), defensive specialist and rebounder. In his expanded role, he set the tone of the tournament with a sweet little turnaround jumper in the first game and a no-look, behind the back pass in the quarterfinals. John W. Doherity (3D), recently engaged, the team leader in scoring and chatting with the refs before the game. Patrick Mac, Force (3D), player/coach in the Bob Cousy mold, a shooter more than willing to jack up a shot as soon as he can see the hoop. Which in no way distinguishes him from anyone else on the team. Yon Okorodudu (2D), a tough rebounder and scorer off the dribble who laughs loud while watching cartoons. Yon laid a guy out while driving through the lane in the finals. Brian Nurse (3D) played excellent defense and had a couple of three pointers in between his awovals that he ought to be Chippendale's model. His defensive intensity was matched only by his love of Wendy's.

The members of the team who were unable to make the trip are three-years Julian Reilly, Dan Feinstein, and Dan Becker, second year Dave Amendola, and first years Hank Baer, Tom Yih, and Alex Gay.

The men's team plays in the New York Urban Professional League. There will be several spotswe but not necessarily shots, open on next year due to the exodus of the third years.

LETTERS

continued from page 2

the corner of 626 Street and Columbus Avenue for thereabouts it can and should build a mixed use building with a law school mixed with commercial space. The commercial space would defray much of the capital cost of reconstituting the law school's physical plant. I want to see that building and want to do three things there: sip a flute of champagne to inaugurate the building, have a dry martini to enjoy the building, and teach one class there to fulfill my professional aspirations. Then I plan to perform an extra-ordinary zoological feat: I will sing the swan song of a dinosaur.

I think the idea is of enough general interest to publish in full.

Yours Very Truly,

Joseph M. Perillo

Dear Editor:

I am writing to express my opinion about the issues raised in the article, "Third Year Student Cited for Defacing Property," that appeared in the March 21, 1996 edition of The Advocate. The article raises a number of issues which, taken together, leave the impression that the act was racially inspired.

If, as mentioned above, some school administrators (who had seen the defacement) felt that reasonable people could differ as to whether the act was "racially motivated," then the true intention of the offender remains unknown, and a presumption of innocence must apply. To overcome this presumption, it

staff of the Fordham Urban Law Journal also agreed to sensitivity training for reasons — and under circumstances — which are not clear given the facts in the article.

In an increasingly race-conscious society like America, all of us — of course — need to be particularly aware of the ways in which we interact with members of other racial or ethnic groups. At the same time, we also need to take special care that emotional issues involving the differences among us do not lead us to abandon those principles of due process which are the ultimate guaranty in securing our individual rights.

Based solely on the facts presented in the March 21 article, it seems that all due process protections were not met in this case. A sanction requiring a written apology and an assigned paper to atone for the defacement seems appropriate under the circumstances. Sensitivity training — for the offender and members of his journal — does not seem appropriate, given the context of the article, since the facts presented fail to meet the burden of proof necessary to support the contention that the act was racially inspired.

Respect for one another and respect for due process march hand in hand, and both are necessary in the continuing struggle for everyone's civil and human rights.
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Respect for one another and respect for due process march hand in hand, and both are necessary in the continuing struggle for everyone's civil and human rights.

If you answered yes to any of these questions, The Advocate can use you. If you are interested in writing for Fordham Law School's official student newspaper, then please contact us at 636-6964.

Do you have too much time on your hands?
Do you have no consideration for contracts?
Do you feel like abandoning Civil Procedure for failure to state a claim for which relief can be granted?
Do you simply own no property and therefore see no reason for studying it?

If you answered yes to any of the previous questions, The Advocate can use you. If you are interested in writing for Fordham Law School's official student newspaper, then please contact us at 636-6964.

May 16, 1996 • The Advocate
LOOKING FOR A FEW GOOD WOMEN AND MEN

The Academic Enrichment Program (AEP) has openings for (13) Teacher’s Assistants (TAs) and (2) TA Managers.

Qualifications:
- Commitment to mentoring first year students
- Enthusiasm for the law school experience
- Ability to commit 10 hrs. per week meeting with and advising first year students
- Desire to teach
- Ability to work and interact with students from diverse socio-economic backgrounds
- Writing and oral presentation skills
- Team player

Salary: $1,500 per academic year (approximately 200 hrs. beginning in July)

Job Description:
The AEP program will begin in June with a series of training and orientation sessions for the TAs. Most meetings are scheduled in the evening and occasionally on Saturdays. During the summer session the TA will select a skill and prepare a presentation on topics such as: briefing cases, outlining, legal writing and exam preparation. Presentations will take place each night beginning July 29th and ending on August 9th. Only those who can attend each evening will be considered for a TA position.

During each semester the TA will be responsible for preparing and presenting group workshops. In the past TAs have conducted workshops on: study groups, exam preparation, oral argument, and interview techniques. Also, required are monthly staff meetings during each semester.

TA Managers will work closely with the Director and TAs in shaping and organizing the program. In the past Managers have: prepared program directories, organized orientations, drafted and distributed minute meeting notes, managed workshop presentations, organized staff meetings, managed the advertising of semester workshops, and drafted evaluations.

Application Process:
Interested students should send a resume, first semester grades, and a cover letter detailing their interest to: Heidi Hamilton Caldwell, FDIC, 452 5th Avenue, New York, NY 10018.

APPLICATION DEADLINE IS MAY 10, 1996. Students will be selected for interviews and selections will be made on or about June 3, 1996. The first scheduled staff meeting is June 7th. If you have any questions please call Ms. Caldwell at (212)704-1375.

ENROLL NOW & PAY LATER

As a special promotion during April and May, you may enroll in the BAR/BRI New York Bar Review Course in one of two ways.

COMPLETE AN ENROLLMENT APPLICATION

1997 GRADS

Include your $75 registration fee and secure a $1495 tuition. This entitles you to receive selected BAR/BRI outlines and review lectures throughout law school, preparation for the MPRE plus computer software for Evidence.

OR

Put NO MONEY DOWN and secure a $1525 discounted tuition. You will be billed in June for the $75 registration fee. The $75 payment, due by July 15th, will "lock in" the discounted tuition. Upon payment of the $75 registration fee, you are entitled to receive all the benefits listed above.

1998/99 GRADS

Include your $75 registration fee and secure a $1445 tuition. This entitles you to receive the First Year Review Volume, software for Contracts, Criminal Law, Property and Torts, lectures for your first year subjects, plus all the benefits listed for 1997 grads.

OR

Put NO MONEY DOWN and secure a $1495 discounted tuition. You will be billed in June for the $75 registration fee. The $75 payment, due by July 15th, will "lock in" the discounted tuition. Upon payment of the $75 registration fee, you are entitled to receive all the benefits listed above.

There you have it — two options. With either option, no additional payment beyond the $75 registration fee is required until your last semester of law school. Whichever option you choose, you get New York’s and the nation’s most experienced bar review with a proven track record of success for more than 25 years and you save at least $120 off the 1996 tuition.

Also note, with either option, if you get a job with a firm that pays for your bar review course, we will immediately refund you the $75 that you have placed with us.

Additionally, if you accept a job in another state, your enrollment may be transferred to that state and you will receive the tuition in effect at the time of your enrollment.

To take advantage of either option, see your representative or contact us at (800)472-8899.

Trust the POWER OF EXPERIENCE to work for you
Don’t fail your Bar Exam because of your MBE.

Pass. Guaranteed.*
With the MicroMash MBE Review.
It’s the comprehensive, computerized solution, with the official questions from the most recently released MBE.

Worried about your MBE? Concerned that a last-minute seminar, and three days of prep, may not be enough? Not sure if your MBE has the "real" questions?
It’s no wonder you’re worried. And you’re not alone.
Set your mind at ease with the MicroMash MBE Review. It uses over 2,000 questions — including the official questions from the most recently released MBE. It includes SMH Bar Review materials. It also includes a built-in personal instructor that pinpoints your strengths and weaknesses, forces you to overcome your weak areas, and drives you hard to your ultimate goal:

- It’s more comprehensive and disciplined than a seminar. It provides personalized help and guidance every step of the way. It drills you, guides you, and tells you when you’re really ready for your MBE.
- All you need is a PC — Windows® or DOS — or an Apple Macintosh®, and this amazing interactive software.
- Use it with one of our state packages, or even another provider’s state package, and we guarantee you’ll pass your Bar Exam.

Complete your MBE Review, and if you don’t pass your Bar Exam, we’ll give you free updates of our MBE Review until you do.

Call to order or for your FREE demo disks today:

1-800-BAR-EXAM,
Ext. 6225

Free Demo Disks!
Call now!

MicroMash Bar Review

6402 South Troy Circle • Englewood, CO 80111-6424
1-800-BAR-EXAM • Fax: (303) 799-1425 • e-mail: MicroMash@icslearn.com

All other trademarks are the property of their respective companies.

* Complete our MBE Review, and if you don’t pass your Bar Exam, we’ll give you free updates of our MBE Review until you do.
Certain restrictions apply. Call for complete details.
I happen to think that the content of my mother’s life her myths, her superstitions, her prayers, the contents of her pantry, the smell of her kitchen, the song that escaped from her sometimes parched lips, her thoughtful repose and pregnant laughter are all worthy of art. Hence, Seven Guitars.

by Miles Marshall Lewis (’96)

Throughout, tuberculosis plagues rage of questions from the various judges, he offensively, this “Uhawetito think that the...” note from the judge.

August Wilson, winner of two Pulitzer Prizes for Fences and The Piano Lesson, becomes a benevolent influence on Headley, giving him the masculine validation he needs by leading him to believe she carries his child.

Playwright Wilson continues his mastery of theatrical language that separates the form from cinema with Seven Guitars. Rather than wordy, the dialogue and story are specifically theatrical in nature, pleasingly so. The band, Headley, Ruby, and her cousin Louise (Michelle Shau) provide an excellent foil to the Easterbrook wonder. As far as the merits of the case, the panel did not treat them any less well.

In Seven Guitars, Chicago represents the Utopian ideal of the North for the Southerners in question—a city with no segregation, where blacks are treated with equal respect by whites. In his first sojourn to Chicago, Floyd travelled with hands Roscoe Red Carter (Tommy Hollis) and Canewell (Ruben Santiago-Hudson) to record “That’s All Right.” Floyd also brought along Pearl Brown, his woman-on-the-side who he thought at the time believed in him more than Vera, a practical cynic. The play picks up where Floyd returns to Pittsburgh with a successful record, attempting to reconcile with Vera; Pearl left him when the initial release of his record was met with indifference.

Throughout, tuberculosis plagues the mental health of Headley. His rantings on the royal African lineage of black Americans coupled with his mental instability reflect the general unbelievability some hold about such beliefs. The death of a crowing rooster at his hands underscores his troubled state. The anecdote he relates several times during the course of the play of a Buddy Bolden story, bringing a large sum of money to him as a gift from his deceased father—ends up possessing a greater significance to the outcome of Seven Guitars.

A visiting “fast behind” cousin, Ruby (Rosalyn Coleman, formerly of The Piano Lesson), becomes a benevolent influence on Headley, giving him the masculine validation he needs by leading him to believe she carries his child.

Playwright Wilson continues his mastery of theatrical language that separates the form from cinema with Seven Guitars. Rather than wordy, the dialogue and story are specifically theatrical in nature, pleasingly so. The band, Headley, Ruby, and her cousin Louise (Michelle Shau) provide an excellent foil to the love story brewing between Floyd Barton and Vera. In Seven Guitars, Wilson has crafted another masterwork from the palette of African-American life.
When the Intolerants Take on the Intolerable
by John Mastandrea

There was big news in New York City talk radio last week when WABC-AM fired longtime conservative curmudgeon Bob Grant. The announcement brought considerable joy to the ultra-liberal extremists (if whatever it is we call each other these days) who had campaigned for years for his banishment.

...So was Grant supposed to hold back in commenting on the Brown plane crash? If your answer is yes, reach back into ancient history to recall the day another Ron, this one Reagan, was shot by a would-be assassin. How many people chortled their dismay at his surviving? Would you prescribe repercussions for them as well?

In any event, a radio station is free to hire and fire anyone it wants, and it is free to pay homage to whatever group of wild-eyed crazies happen to be caged outside waving illegible placards. WABC further assured the public that its decision to dispose of the Grant PD dilemma had nothing to do with the station's new corporate owner, Disney. (And elephants can fly.) And please, shed no tears over Grant, who will undoubtedly pop up again somewhere down the dial to once again fill the airwaves with his special brand of venom. But the sacking of Grant does involve one interesting phenomenon: Grant had the audience and he delivered. "I'm a pessimist," Grant explained.

Hence the furor. Now, it is not without risk that a law student casts his lot with the likes of Bob Grant and Brown Grant and Bob Grant to see how they measure up.

Brown was a politician. As Commerce Secretary his role (from what can be inferred from his campaign contributions) is to separate Brown the man from Brown the politician? Maybe, but most Americans knew only the politician, motivated by the raw desire to gain influence. (Your support, your vote for my campaign contribution.) Anyone who thinks otherwise should watch a little less Dan Rather and a little more C-SPAN.

As for Grant, his mission is to establish an influence but an audience - the broadcast equivalent of marketshare. Grant did that, and he did so by giving voice to popular sentiments ignored or scorned by his media outlets. Grant took on the prevailing orthodoxies and was cheered by his listeners and simultaneously reviled by those who did not like what he was saying (yeah, they say he's racist; they also say Pat Buchanan is anti-Semitic, and Louis Farrakhan is Libyan, and George Washington was a Freemason, etc.).
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Brown was a politician. As Commerce Secretary his role (from what can be inferred from his campaign contributions) is to separate Brown the man from Brown the politician? Maybe, but most Americans knew only the politician, motivated by the raw desire to gain influence. (Your support, your vote for my campaign contribution.) Anyone who thinks otherwise should watch a little less Dan Rather and a little more C-SPAN.
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A Multistate course should focus your attention. Unfortunately, other courses just aren't achieving this with their large classes, unrealistic practice questions, and lack of experience in standardized testing. The Princeton Review/Emanuel method is different. We cover the material actually on the Multistate, and give you proven techniques for mastering that material.

- **Representative Questions**
  Focus on the types of questions you will actually encounter on the Multistate.

- **Multistate Multiple-Choice Expertise**
  Learn how to identify and overcome the traps inherent to the Multistate multiple-choice exam.

- **Live Instruction**
  Our highly trained attorneys personally answer your questions.

- **Several Simulated Multistates**
  Prepare for the real Multistate with several practice exams, including two under actual test-taking conditions.

- **Small Classes**
  Classes of no more than 15 students guarantee you personal attention from expert, approachable instructors.

- **Steven Emanuel on Videotape**
  4 hours of the law guru reviewing the most important areas of substantive law found on the Multistate.

For more information, please call us at (800) 2-REVIEW or reach us online at www.review.com
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