

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

The Advocate

Student Publications

12-18-1968

The Advocate

The Advocate, Fordham Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/student_the_advocate



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

The Advocate, Fordham Law School, "The Advocate" (1968). *The Advocate*. 20.
https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/student_the_advocate/20

This Newspaper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Publications at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Advocate by an authorized administrator of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact tmelnick@law.fordham.edu.

The Advocate

The Student Newspaper of Fordham University School of Law

Vol. I - No. 2

LINCOLN SQUARE, N. Y.

Wednesday, December 18, 1968

Student Bar Agrees To Direct Elections

The SBA on Dec. 4th at a stormy meeting made a significant reform by approving an amendment to its own constitution which calls for the direct election of SBA executive officers. The amendment passed by a 16 to 4 roll-call vote. However before that vote was taken there was a serious eleventh hour challenge to amend the measure so as to delay its ratification.

Marc Grossman of 2-A, who originally started the move toward direct elections and who authored the successful amendment, presented and explained the proposed changes to the SBA Board of Governors. At this point Dan Carson of 2-B proposed that Board of Governors approval of the amendment be only provisional depending on the outcome of a student referendum.

The debate on this point raged for nearly an hour. Most of those people in favor of direct elections opposed this rider as a delaying tactic which was only going to ask the students a question whose answer seemed obvious — "Do you want the right to vote?" It was also pointed out that when student rights are taken away by the SBA (as had happened last year when the SBA constitution was amended) there was no desire on anybody's part to ask for a student referendum on the change. Only when the SBA moves to increase student participation is the cry for a referendum heard.

A vote was finally taken as to whether this rider should be approved. By a 10 to 8 vote it was not approved and the amendment went before the SBA unchanged where it was ratified.

The new provisions of the constitution provide for the direct election of the four executive officers of the SBA. Previously these offices were filled by an

election confined to the Board of Governors. Any SBA member can run for one of these executive offices, although the office of president is restricted to only those students who will be seniors next year. The election will take place sometime between Feb. 15th and March 15th at our present President John LaSalle's discretion.

At this meeting the SBA also expressed its sympathy with the cause of the Lincoln Center liberal arts students in their demand that their curriculum not be emasculated. In a related move, a committee was formed to study the Gellhorn Report so that the SBA could take a position regarding University finances.

The issue of free speech for student sponsored speakers came up within the context of the Roy Cohn controversy. Mr. Cohn, who spoke here last Thursday, was invited prior to his recent indictment and attack on U.S. Attorney Robert Morgenthau. Some of the faculty felt that Mr. Cohn should not be given a platform from which to attack Mr. Morgenthau and that he should be advised to confine his remarks to his announced topic, the McCarthy era. The SBA passed a resolution that stated that Mr. Cohn should not be so advised and that there should be no interference with anyone's right to free speech at student sponsored events.

McLaughlin Resigns As President; New Board Of Trustees Is Named

By John Camillo

On Tuesday, December 17, Fordham University announced the resignation of Father Leo McLaughlin as University President and an enlargement of its Board of Trustees that will give laymen a majority. Father Michael P. Walsh, former President of Boston College, will assume the post of University President.

At a surprise news conference held at Fordham Law School at the Lincoln Center campus Father

of the university's financial difficulties and student unrest at both the Rose Hill and Lincoln Center campuses.

Fr. Walsh Named

Father Walsh is 56 years old and has served as President of Boston College for ten years before becoming President of Fordham's Board of Trustees eight months ago. After graduating from Boston College, Father Walsh earned his master of science and doctoral degrees from Fordham and is the first holder of a Fordham doctorate to become its president.

New Board

Also announced was the addition of fifteen laymen, including several non-Catholics, and two Jesuits to the newly expanded Board of Trustees. Mr. Joseph A. Kaiser, president of The Williamsburgh Savings Bank, has been named as president of the new twenty-six member Board. Mr. Kaiser has been a member of the Lay Board of Trustees of Fordham since 1958.

In response to questions Mr. Kaiser stated that the essential meaning of a majority of lay trustees would be to "produce a greater rapport as far as the business community and city of New York is concerned."

Deceit Denied

Father Walsh said that the new restructuring was "in no way related to the recent dissent at Fordham." Father McLaughlin also added that the timing of the announcement was not motivated by the fact that the majority of the university is currently on Christmas vacation.

One question left unanswered was why the old Board of Trustees did not delay the selection of the new president until the new lay members of the board are added.



Fr. McLaughlin, who just announced his resignation as President and appointment as Chancellor, answers questions.

McLaughlin said that he had asked to be relieved of his duties because he had "come to realize that it is virtually impossible for one man to do all the things that are demanded of a university president today." Father McLaughlin expressed his desires to devote his full time and efforts to meeting Fordham's present and future financial needs. Accordingly he has been appointed to the newly created post of chancellor, whose primary responsibility will be to develop support to meet the financial needs that face Fordham.

Father McLaughlin, who served as president for three years, has recently come under fire because

Notice to all students who are planning to withdraw from the Law School prior to examinations or in the early part of the second semester. Please notify the office in writing and indicate if you intend to return at a future date.

Special Report:

Where Has All The Money Gone?

In the midst of the current upheaval among the undergraduate divisions of the University, an issue of vital interest to the law student has once again come to the fore: namely, Where Has All The Money Gone? The present relevance of this question is evidenced by the fact that the tuition dollar at Fordham Law School may very well be spent for items widely divorced from the legal education for which the tuition-paying student or parent intended it.

Figures obtained from past budget reports and from Assistant Dean Robert Hanlon would indicate that prior to the 1968 tuition hike the Law School operated at a profit from its tuition alone, exclusive of fees, endowment, gifts and other collections. Nonetheless, the University Trustees saw fit to increase the annual tuition at the Law School from \$1300 to \$1600 for the Day Division and from \$975 to \$1200 for the Evening Division. Indeed, University President Rev. Leo McLaughlin has indicated recently that the Administration is considering an increase in tuition for "some professional and graduate schools," while undergraduate tuition is to remain at its present level. While it is unclear what schools are included within this group, the Law School is the only graduate or professional school with a sizeable student body and presumably, the only school within the University which could sustain another tuition increase, especially in light of the complacent manner in which it accepted the last hike. With this in mind, Law School administration sources have indicated that a tuition increase would not be unexpected.

The School of Law is not financially autonomous from

its parent University. Rather, all money from tuition, fees, endowment, gifts and the like are paid directly into the coffers of Alma Mater, to be doled out sparingly to the school which collected it. The result of such a system is painfully obvious: Fordham Law School, which ranks within the top 20% of law schools in the nation vis-a-vis amount of tuition charged, enjoys one of the poorest faculty-student ratios; the Law School is trapped in a University-wide faculty hiring freeze which has severely hampered curriculum expansion and the institution of new programs at the school for which additional and expert faculty would be required; the reports of the Student Bar Association Academic Planning Committee for the past two years show serious deficiencies within the operation of the Law School, many of which may be traced to Rose Hill's cries of lack of funds in the face of increased operating costs.

It has long been the policy of the American Bar Association to examine the profit-margin of American law schools in order to fight the spread of "diploma mills" and to prevent the charging of premium tuition for inferior legal education. Certainly the education at this Law School could not be termed "inferior." But the tuition is a premium tuition, and that premium is not being returned to its students in the form of needed improvements at the School of Law.

In the area of student activities, the Student Bar Association receives \$1,000, the Moot Court receives \$2,500 (a stipend for its "committee") and the Law Review, a student publication designed primarily for the profession and not the students, receives \$17,500. The gratuity which

the SBA receives is so inadequate to meet its expenses that it must require its members to pay dues. In a University whose Faculty Senate has a budget of \$950 for "social gatherings," whose Student Activities budget for schools other than the School of Law exceeds \$150,000 and whose President has a budget of \$8,000 for "charity" (which, one hopes, begins at home), surely there must be funds available to the Student Bar Association which are commensurate with the amount paid into the school in tuition by its members!

As it now stands, the financial picture of the Law School is rather bleak: The School of Law pays into the University more than it receives in return; the student activities at the school are grossly under-subsidized; the Administration speaks of a tuition increase in its money-making Law School, and the students at Lincoln Center remain uninformed as usual.

Through the new joint faculty-student committee at the Law School, and through the two representatives (one faculty and one student) from the Law School to the newly-formed University Budget Committee, the School of Law may be able to receive a more reasonable dole from its parasite parent. A constructive probe into University finances will continue until accurate figures have been obtained, until inequities in the distribution of funds are erased, and until the law student or parent who pays tuition is fully informed with regard to the disposition of his dollars. But for the present, the question remains: "Where Has All The Money Gone?"

—Editorials—

Cry Wolf

There were two simultaneous events at Fordham last week. In one a group of Negro students barricaded themselves in, and others out, of Dr. Meade's office so they could "persuade" him to meet their demands. The other event was a cluster of student, faculty, and parent meetings at the Liberal Arts College to see what could be done about its newly announced extinction.

The demonstration at Rose Hill focused the public's attention on a relatively minor issue, to wit: whether or not the University would comply with a law that hasn't been passed (preventing financial aid to student demonstrators). It prevented the public from finding out about the more important discontinuation of the experimental Liberal Arts College.

Why?

The first fault lies with the students who provoked the Rose Hill demonstration and the Administration for giving in to their demands and condoning their actions. The students obviously had no right to apply the pressure they did. The result was tragic. But the Administration was just as wrong, and is looking for more trouble, by giving in and not disciplining the responsible students, thereby condoning their actions. The twenty students in Dr. Meade's office didn't represent University opinion, they only represented themselves. If they can get away with their forceful actions, any other similarly small group of students with different or opposing views can do the same thing. It's called anarchy. Or chaos.

The other fault is with the news media — television, radio, and the press. The "in" thing these days is forceful and violent student demonstrations. And wherever there is physical force, that's where the news media is. This has absolutely no relationship to the issues at stake in any demonstration. In fact, the media play up the "action" and hardly mention or discuss the reasons for it. Thus the students who barricaded themselves in Dr. Meade's office made the front pages, and the demise of the experimental Liberal Arts College was forgotten.

A few irresponsible students made such a loud noise about a small thing that when the real wolf came along no one was interested except those being eaten. And there wasn't anything they could do about it all alone.

Financial Fiasco

The expose on the front page of how the Law School is not getting its fair share of financial aid from the University calls for further investigation. A large part of our tuition goes to support the University, rather than pay for more law school faculty or more law school activities.

The most appalling fact, however, is the extent of Fordham's financial mess. Fordham University was forced to liquidate a \$12 million portfolio over the summer, is discontinuing an experimental college after one year because it can't hire thirty new teachers, just built a 14-story building and suddenly doesn't have enough students to fill it, spent \$50,000 to commission a statue of Peter the Fisherman, who represents the spirit of the (ex-) Liberal Arts College, and underestimated tuition this year by \$1 million. This can only be considered gross incompetence and mismanagement of its financial affairs.

The only way to correct this is by getting competent people with financial expertise on the Board of Trustees. The present nine members of the Board (all Jesuits) will be receiving nominations and applications in the next few weeks for new additional members to the Board. The new Board may have a maximum membership of thirty-one. It behooves the present Board of Trustees to choose some men (or women) for the Board with a good background in financial planning. The University needs some competent financial advice.

Porrino And Flynn Win Prize

Joseph Porrino and John Flynn are the winners of the final argument in the I. Maurice Wormser Competition which was held on Tuesday, December 10. Fordham Law School was honored by the presence of Judge Moore of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and Judges Pollack and McLean of the District Court for the Southern District of New York who acted as Chief Justice, and Associate Justices, respectively.

The two winners and the other participants in this argu-

ment, Robert Marin, Kenneth Burrows, John Flynn, and Joseph Porrino, were the four highest scoring contestants in the Semi-final rounds held during the two weeks prior to the Final argument. The other eight semi-finalists were Deveraux Milburn, Kerry Trainor, Brian Sichel, Robert Worthing, Stephen O'Leary, David Ross, David Wallace, and Jim Fuller. The twelve semi-finalists were the highest scoring contestants of the twenty-four participants in the first round arguments.

The Wormser Competition as well as the Freshman Competition which is run in the spring is run by the Appellate Moot Court Committee of the Student Bar Association, chaired by Bart Freedman-3B. The committee is in charge of the administration of all facets of the Competition with the exception of procuring the judges for the different arguments. This function is performed by Professor Robert A. Kessler, the faculty moderator of the Appellate Moot Court Committee.

The I. Maurice Wormser Prize is awarded to each of the four finalists, and in addition the George W. Bacon Award is given to the writers of the highest scoring brief, Ken Burrows, and Dave Wallace, both 2A. In addition, Joseph Porrino and John Flynn, the winners of the Competition, will represent Fordham in the various inter-school moot court competitions that will be occurring in the coming months.



John Flynn and Joseph Porrino (left to right) after winning the I. Maurice Wormser Appellate Moot Court Competition.

Bar Results

Dean Mulligan announced that 87% of the Fordham graduates who took the Bar Examination last July passed it. This is the highest percentage for the law school in recent years. Last year 64% passed, just enough to keep Fordham even with the state average.

Comment

Instant Curriculum Reform

By MARC GROSSMAN

If our generation is different from that of our parents it is because we are freed from concerns about our own survival. While our parents viewed a professional education as the key to economic security, more and more of our contemporaries view it as a necessary prerequisite to remake society. Whether you view this change with enthusiasm or alarm makes little difference — it is a fact, and it is becoming increasingly more the case. One look at the legal profession confirms this.

The law as a profession has changed. Today the opportunities open to young attorneys have never been greater as new areas of legal practice have opened up as a result of our increased awareness of social injustice. In the future these new areas of the law are going to demand greater numbers of qualified lawyers. Dean Mulligan, in his address to the freshman, acknowledged that today's law students have more varied opportunities and goals. However, a law school must provide more than an awareness of a law student's needs — it must provide those courses necessary to prepare the student for the bar and beyond that for his role in the legal profession.

Fordham Law has done a spectacular job in preparing students to pass the bar, however it is no secret that our curriculum falls far short when it comes to preparing students for those areas of the law that are becoming increasingly more important. That doesn't only apply to poverty law, but also to areas of corporate practice such as trademark law and security regulations. The fact is that our choice of electives is simply too limited to adequately prepare the student to meet the increased scope and complexity of today's legal profession.

The Administration is aware of the need for an enlarged and liberalized selection of electives. This year there are five new electives including a course on the Law of the Urban Poor. However as Dean Mulligan pointed out in his state of the law school address last year, true curriculum reform must wait until the right people can be found to teach new courses and, more fundamentally, until the University is on a more solid financial footing to pay the expense that an expanded curriculum would incur. Although one might argue the merits of these limitations, assuming their validity and the Administrations current inability to provide new courses, we as stu-

dents of Fordham should still not be content with a legal education that shortchanges us.

There is a way for the Administration to immediately expand our choice of electives while it seeks to slowly build up the curriculum. What I propose is that Fordham allow interested students to take summer courses, for credit toward their degree, at NYU or some other accredited law school that has a summer session. Presently Fordham will not accept credits from any other law school (although NYU and Columbia, two law schools whose position Fordham aspires to, do accept such transfer credits). Credit would be given only for those courses which Fordham does not give. Such a system would provide interested students with the opportunity to take more specialized courses in their area of interest so that they could better compete with graduates of schools that provide a more varied curriculum.

Another unexpected result of such a policy could be the possible repatriation of those day students who now seek refuge in the night division. Should 1969 and the new Nixon Administration bring any significant change for the better regarding the draft, many former day students who now attend nights while working at draft deferred jobs would want to come back days. At the present time this is impossible as a second year night student is ten credits short of that needed to enter third year day. However, if these students were allowed to make up the credits during the summer, many would do so as they could then graduate one year earlier. This eventuality, which admittedly depends on a set of unlikely circumstances, could happen and it seems only right to allow those students who were originally accepted to the day division to have the opportunity to return to it.

This plan is far from ideal. Although many students may desire to take a course in Urban Housing and Redevelopment or Communications Law or one of the many courses available at other New York law schools, few would be able to find the time to do so in the summer. Perhaps, until Fordham starts to catch up with the legal profession, provisions should be made to allow Fordham students, during the regular academic year, to take certain courses at neighboring law schools. But for now, as a first positive step toward instant curriculum reform, the Administration should approve a plan allowing summer transfer credits.

The Advocate



Editor-in-Chief
BERNARD W. TALMAS

Managing Editor Marc Grossman
Copy Editor Barton Freedman
Business Editor Jim McBain
Staff Anthony M. Bentley, Gordon Brownell,
Paul Burke, John Camillo, Jim Heffernan, Jon Hutner,
T. Barry Kingham, Dick Klein, John Pellegrin, Hal Platt,
Robert Reardon.

kr

Law Forum Embarks On Ambitious Program

Following a period of suspended events caused by a lack of student interest during the campaign season, the Law Forum resumed a full schedule after Thanksgiving vacation was over. The Young Lawyers Association of the New York Bar Association presented a very informative program discussing legal opportunities for law school graduates in the large and small firms in New York City and in City government. In another informal coffee klatch program in the Student Lounge, Colonel Livingston from the Fordham Uptown ROTC discussed a new and expanded program for law students who wish to participate in ROTC while in law school, thus ending their worries about the draft while training for an officer's rank in the Army.

On December 12th the highlight of the Law Forum's program thus far this year occurred when an address by the colorful and highly controversial attorney and businessman Roy Cohn was presented.

On December 19th, Colonel Paul Akst, Director of the Selective Service System for New York City, will present an address on the status of law students and the draft. His talk last year on this subject packed the Moot Courtroom and all students, especially those in the first two years, are urged to attend the program. In early February the Law Forum will present a series of six informal coffee hours with representatives from the various branches of the military, VISTA and the Peace Corps, similar to the series which drew a wide response last spring.

Gordon Brownell, the Chairman of the Law Forum, states that he hopes to present at least one program each week during the next semester. To do so he needs the assistance of other students who are interested in working on the Forum, and those interested in doing so are requested to contact him or leave their names in the SBA office.

Cases Finished In Trial Court

The Trial Moot Court Committee conducted two trials this semester with Hon. Louis J. Capozzoli of the Supreme Court, Appellate Division, First Department, presiding at the trial of **People v. Hammer**, a murder case. Gordon Brownell, Esq. and Jay Wilker, Esq. ably prosecuted the case with James Donovan, Esq. and Charles Brennan, Esq. conducting the defense.

The second trial was presided over by Hon. Ross DiLorenzo of the Civil Court of the City of New York. Michael Corrigan, Esq. and Theodore Bajo, Esq. represented the plaintiff and Barry Kingham, Esq. and Jeffrey Ramer, Esq. represented the defendant in the case of **Morgan v. Manhattan Ice Co. et al.** The jury retired after excellent presentations by both sides and came back with a 9-2 verdict for the defendant.

With these trials the Moot Court Program concludes its fall semester, under the chairmanship of John Pellegrin. The participating attorneys have commented on the experience and exposure to trial

Roy Cohn Speaks Here; Criticizes Walker Report

Roy Cohn, former chief counsel to Sen. Joseph McCarthy and Assistant U.S. Attorney, and presently under federal indictment for alleged criminal activities in connection with the Fifth Ave. Bus Corp., spoke Thursday to a standing room crowd at the Law Forum.

Mr. Cohn, who has made headlines recently because of his attack on Robert M. Morgenthau, U.S. Attorney for the Southern District, spoke about the McCarthy era. After his informal remarks which contained many amusing anecdotes, Mr. Cohn answered questions. In response to a ques-

tion he expressed his opinion as to the roots of the alleged Morgenthau vendetta against him, which goes back to Mr. Cohn's handling of a matter affecting Mr. Morgenthau's father, who was then Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Cohn also commented on the Walker Report which labelled the Chicago convention disturbances as a "police riot." He felt that the report failed to tell both sides of the issue and made broad accusations without proper documentation.

advocacy gained, as well as the first year students who ably participated as parties, witnesses, and court officers.

Mr. Pellegrin and his assistants, Robert Blackburn and Stephen DeVito are now in the process of revising the fact patterns and preparing cases for next semester's program for third and fourth year student-attorneys.

BGG - NOG-PARTY
FREE!

Thursday, December 19th
from 4 to 8 p.m.

The Student Lounge

Sponsored by The International
Law Society and the S.B.A.

Nixon's The One—What Now?

On The Left

By James P. Heffernan and Paul E. Burke

1968 has been an astounding year for all of us who are "entertained" by the mass media. We have seen the "new politics" come and go. Doris Day, the professional virgin, has graduated from the movies to do her own pure T.V. show. Thirty year old Elvis Presley, via a T.V. special, is trying to revive an appeal of 10 years past. But even more incredible, R. Milhaus Nixon, the political phoenix, once considered less appealing to today's sophisticated audience than "I Love Lucy," projected himself through the mass media into the presidency.

Although he didn't exactly receive an overwhelming mandate (as far as we can tell, Alaska and Missouri are still "too close to call") his job is to govern and govern he must. An important part of this job is for the new Administration to keep us informed and "tell it like it is." The widespread fear is that Nixon will "tell it as they like it" or "tell it as they feel like it." At any rate, Mr. Nixon is going to have to deal with his arch enemy, THE PRESS.

Even though the "New Nixon" is now programmed, monogrammed and suntanned, it is practically inconceivable that he could abolish public information altogether. So the press conference still lives and the press has a new Nixon "to kick around" for four years.


It is now late in January, 1969. The Press Corps is restlessly waiting in the new drab "Business Gray Room" (it's Dick's favorite color), where from behind the bullet proof shield the 37th President of the U.S. springs to center stage. Beside him troops vivacious Pat, sultry Tricia, newly wed July, a somewhat haggard David Eisenhower and, off at a distance, brother Ed Nixon.

Birmingham Press: Mr. President, could you elaborate on a frequently mentioned theme in your campaign, the idea of "Black Capitalism"?

Pres.: I'm sorry that I've been misquoted on this. I meant "Black Capital." My ideas on this subject are simple and direct. The black capital is to be Waverly, Minn. All Negroes will be sent there, however travel permits will be issued by Sen. Thurmond's OEO, Office of Expanding Oppression.

Ladies Home Journal: Mr. President, what distinctive impression will your wife leave upon the White House as First Lady?

Editor's Note: The two views of President-elect Nixon which are expressed on this page represent more than simply words but rather attitudes. On the left Mr. Nixon is viewed with suspicion and distrust while the right views liberals and liberal institutions with the same misgiving. Such polarization is a fact of our times and as president, Mr. Nixon must come to grips with it if he is to "Bring Us Together."



Pres.: We plan to beautify the White House grounds by replacing the Kennedy Rose Garden. Throughout the years of political struggle Pat and I have both become fond of home-grown sour grapes, a taste we acquired in California. In four year's time we believe we can produce an abundant supply of sour grapes right here on the White House grounds.

New York Times: Mr. President, a lot of controversy has centered around Vice-Pres. Agnew. Could you tell us at this time just what duties Mr. Agnew would have in the Nixon Administration?

Pres.: I'm glad you asked me that, Zero, I mean Spiro, and I were recently discussing this topic. The duties we decided on were numerous and I can only relate to you the most important ones. The first is that which I mentioned before about removing the old Kennedy Rose Garden. I feel that Mr. Guru can gain valuable administrative experience working with the White House Staff gardeners. And, of course, there is that

matter of raising funds for the 1972 Olympics.

U.S. News and World Report: Why must the U.S. have superiority rather than parity in the arms race?

Pres.: Well, it's true that the nuclear stockpile at present could blow up the planet several times. It's also true that parity is sufficient to act as a deterrent. But isn't there a greater issue of safety involved here. Who protects your job if all those military contracts are cancelled?

Harrisburg Evening News: I would like to direct my question to David Eisenhower. There has been quite a lot of speculation that you too would like to occupy the White House, like your grandfather and father-in-law. Is there any truth to this rumor?

David: As you know, I'm only 20 years old, and I really haven't thought about my career yet. And of course it will be 14 years, 3 months, and 21 days until I meet the Constitutional age requirement

(Continued on Page 4)

On The Right

By Gordon S. Brownell

One of the most popular games nowadays (if that trend-setter The New York Times is an example) is to speculate on what course the Nixon Administration is going to take as it attempts to solve the mountain of problems which the Kennedy and Johnson years have bequeathed to the American people. Apparently the way in-people play the game is to say something to the effect of "Well, gee whiz, I don't know what Nixon's going to do because after all he hasn't said anything since he opened his campaign." This is the pattern which most of Mr. Nixon's critics have chosen to follow since his election last month, with the indubitable Mr. Arthur Schlesinger running away with first place in the game due to his incredibly long and equally yawn-inducing article in the November 17th edition of The New York Times Magazine. In what is ostensibly a critique on what the Nixon Administration will be like, Mr. Schlesinger reaches the conclusion that he just can't say what it will be like because, after all, our next President is just too "elusive" a man to pin down. The unfortunate thing is that by wasting its article on what to look for in the Nixon Administration on a man who doesn't know what he's talking about, The Times did a grave disservice to its readers. For while Mr. Schlesinger has obvious difficulties grasping the complexities of modern politics, there are others who do not. William Buckley, James Jackson Kilpatrick, Russell Kirk and William Rusher are but four of many such individuals who could have given the Times readership the type of keen insight and evaluation to which they are entitled, while at the same time providing them with a constructive analysis of what Americans can look forward to during the Nixon years.

The outlook is for a slight but perceptible trend to the right in the initial stages of the Nixon Administration, with the movement away from the Liberal policies of the previous administrations becoming increasingly more evident as Mr. Nixon begins to receive the respect and confidence of a larger segment of the nation. While both the make-up of his Cabinet and his early policies will reflect his deep desire to heal the schisms in America, Mr. Nixon will not lose sight of the fact that it has been the permissive, promise-them-everything attitudes

(Continued on Page 4)

True Confessions: Girls Love Law

With General Hershey digging into the classroom, the law school is getting more women students. To find out why eighteen chose to start at Fordham this year **The Advocate** moved into the Dean's Conference Room to interview the first-year girls.

Of the eight girls interviewed, all of them mentioned the same two reasons for choosing Fordham Law: it's convenient (either close to home or "New York is a great city") and it has a "good reputation." They're the same nebulous reasons everyone has for coming here. But that's the end of the similarities between the men and the women.

Pre-law school majors ranged from computer programming to political science to city planning. Almost all the girls interviewed expressed disinterest in working for a law firm or in private practice. Rather they are interested in social service or government work, with the emphasis on helping society instead of making money. This humanitarian, noble, and self-sacrificing ideal was best expressed by a young lady (name withheld) who said "I don't have to worry about money, I'm not looking to support myself."

Along the same line, the consensus was that they would prefer to work at their profession part-time rather than hold the standard 9 to 5 job. This was basically to allow time for raising children. But Kathy and Lynne see no reason why a woman shouldn't work full-time at a profession just like a man does. They would hire a

professional to raise their children while they were working.

When asked what they thought of the sherry parties, the gasps of indignation from the girls could be heard in the Dean's Office as all together they remembered Professor Fogelman's party comment "the girls who come to law school are those who couldn't get a husband in college." Absolutely not true they all agreed. Barbara commented "the fellows seem to think we came here looking for husbands, but that's ridiculous; we wouldn't put ourselves in such a strict academic atmosphere to find a husband."

Some general comments:

Rita — "I think the boys can

take a more detached attitude — a more logical approach to law."

Lynne — "I disagree. I'm just as logical; but that isn't saying much."

Phyllis — "The professors seem to favor the girls in class."

Unanimous — No regrets about law school in general or Fordham in particular.

Anonymous — "We're treated like one of the fellas."

The most important information is saved for last. Elaine is married (to an M.D.) and Lynne is engaged.

Elaine also gets an award for honesty. Her last reason for coming to Fordham — "They accepted me."



DEAN POPS IN. Seated (l. to r.) Elaine Postley, Phyllis Brochstein, Kathryn McDonnell. Standing (l. to r.) Marilyn Gainey, Rita Ninivaggio, Eileen Crimmins, Dean Mulligan, Lynne Gertner, Barbara Josefowicz.

Three Professors Join Law Faculty This Year

By Hal Platt

Three new full-time professors have this year been added to the law school faculty. Each brings with him an outstanding record of academic achievement and practical experience acquired through application of his educational training in the actual practice of law.

Professor Barry E. Hawk, a native of Redding, Pa., attended Fordham College and received his A.B. "Summa Cum Laude" in 1962. He studied for a year in the Institute d'Etudes Politiques at the University of Paris, and received his L.L.B. from the University of Virginia in 1965. He was associated with the firm of Pepper, Hamilton and Scheetz in Pennsylvania, and lectured at Temple University Law School in 1967-68.

Professor Hawk, who is not married, was also a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Professor Lawrence V. Kelly, a native of Manhattan, received his A.B. from Columbia in 1962. In 1965 he received his J.D. from Fordham, where he was first in his senior class and received various awards — among them, the Frances Thaddeus Wolff Prize, the Gold Medal in Constitutional Law, and the West Publishing Co. prize. From 1965 to 1967 he was Law Secretary to a Civil Court Judge, and during this period he obtained an L.L.M. from New York University (1966). From 1967 to 1968 he was Law Assistant to the Justices of the Supreme Court, and became Law Secretary to one of the Justices prior to coming to Fordham. He is mar-

ried, and he and his wife expect their first child in February.

Professor John E. Sprizzo was born in Brooklyn, and attended St. John's College and St. John's Law School. He received both his A.B. and his L.L.B. "Summa Cum Laude," and was graduated first in his class in both instances. He also served as an editor of the St. John's Law Review. From 1959 to 1963 he was associated with the Department of Justice in Washington, D.C., where he was assigned to the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section and participated in preparing the well-publicized Appalachian Case. In 1963 he became Assistant U.S. Attorney in the New York Office, and was appointed Chief Appellate Attorney in 1965. From 1966 until coming to Fordham in September, he was Assistant Chief of the Criminal Division.

Professor Sprizzo maintains an active interest in the field of Criminal Law and intends to begin writing in this area soon. His interests are varied, ranging from opera and music to horse-racing and touch-football. He resides with his wife and three children on Staten Island.

On The Left

(Continued from Page 3)

of 35. However, I was planning on going to law school, but I think I'll teach for a few years first.

La Monde: Mr. President, could you tell us how you will get along with General De Gaulle?

Pres.: I've worked closely with generals before. I am used to taking orders from them. De Gaulle and I should have no difficulty agreeing on his ideas.

The Advocate: Does it disturb you that many, perhaps a majority, of the educated young people of your own party preferred Rockefeller, Percy, Hatfield or Lindsay to yourself, Mr. President?

Pres.: No. You've got to remember that a lot of these people didn't like me as Vice-President either. They thought I was small-minded, mean and vindictive, but this never bothered me. What does bother me is the possibility of increased federal aid to education and lower draft calls.

Newsweek: It has been said that the cities need a massive transfusion of aid to restore them. A domestic Marshall Plan has been suggested to save the cities. Yet, you think that federal aid should be reduced in this area and that private business, through tax incentives, should have the responsibility of redevelopment. Can this be done by business alone?

Pres.: Business has had a traditional concern for the community it used. Business knows exactly how and why cities decay since they have accelerated such decay as they relocate as the communities crumble. One might consider business as the expert in the decline of our urban areas.

New York Post: Mr. President, the number of black, Puerto Rican and Mexican-American votes you received could practically be counted on one hand. How do you plan on governing in those areas where you have this type of negligible support?

Pres.: That is an excellent question and, of course, I have a sophisticated solution. As you know I've spoken out in favor of a professional army. You also know that General LeMay has shown

that integration has worked in the armed forces, especially in times of war. Well, keeping these in mind, I came up with the idea of an "all-minority" army, except for the officers of course. This simple solution will take care of many problems. It will get all those young, militant blacks off the streets, into uniforms and under strict supervision. This will cut down on civil disorder and as a bonus, because these people are used to poverty, we won't have to increase the army pay scales for some time.

Peking Press: What will be your policy toward Asia and specifically toward China?

Pres.: I do have a strong feeling for Asia. As one of our greater military minds once declared, you must destroy an area before you can save it. That's the American experience in Asia. So, I can say this to you, with so much land and so many people in your country of China, we will have to have phenomenal destruction before we can save you.

I'm sorry gentlemen, that's all I have time for this year. I promise you that next year's annual press conference will be just as informative. Oh, and by the way, don't quote me.

On The Right

(Continued from Page 3)

of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson that has dragged the nation down to such a low point. The past eight years, and for that matter the twenty years before them, have demonstrated what the responsible American Right has been warning of for years: namely, that by ignoring the traditional American values of individual freedom, self-reliance, private initiative and respect for God, Family, and Nation and replacing them with the Big Brother in Washington knows all and can do all concept the seeds of discontent and disaster are two easily spread. Mr. Nixon will restore the balance once again in favor of the principles upon which our nation was founded, "not," as Senator Goldwater so aptly stated in 1964, "because they are old, but because they are true."

Mr. Nixon, as again The New York Times reminds us, chose to ignore the

advice of such Madison Avenue types as the Mayor of Strike City (whatever happened to all the Fun the man used to tell us about) and instead listened to men like Strom Thurmond and John Tower. While The Times is rather upset that Mr. Nixon had the intelligence to accord Senator Thurmond the respect he deserves, I for one am not and I venture to say that neither are most Americans (60% of the American electorate if you add the Wallace vote). Most of us are quite at ease knowing that our next President is aware of the power and the wisdom of our leading conservative political figures. We remember all too well the naivete which Mr. Nixon demonstrated in 1960 when he chose to deal with Governor Rockefeller and the liberal wing of the GOP and the consequences of that decision. Love that New Nixon! I dare say that as he carries out the policies of his Administration, Mr. Nixon will know where the votes are and will pay counsel to those spokesmen whose views are now shared by the majority of the American people. Largely due to the ineptitude and bungling of the liberal community, the vote for the two conservative candidates was 54,000,000 — double the 1964 vote for Goldwater of 27,000,000! As a nation we are moving towards the Right, rapidly and resolutely, and anyone who thinks Mr. Nixon will mis-read the election returns is foolish. For not only is Mr. Nixon aware of this movement, he is one of the leaders of it. If Mr. Schlesinger doesn't understand why the Goldwaters, Thurmonds and Bo Callowsays were sporting Nixon buttons in Miami Beach then he is further demonstrating his political vacuity.

As to specific things to look for in the next few years, the campaign summed things up in general terms. A greater emphasis will be placed on the role of private industry to solve the problems of our cities, though the role of the federal government will certainly not be eliminated; the "war on poverty" will be streamlined and the wasteful programs which the Democrats used to garnish votes will be done away with and replaced by programs that might actually combat poverty (hopefully the Job Corps will be abolished as soon as possible); the Justice Department will put a re-

newed emphasis on fighting both organized and unorganized crime as well as rooting out and prosecuting the racist and revolutionary incendiaries of the New Left (Stokely Carmichael and his foul-mouthed friends will find that Ramsey Clark won't be around to merely slap their wrists when they perform their treasonous acts and they might find it more comfortable to leave the country); the Department of HEW will respond to the needs of the poor and under-privileged citizens North and South by deciding that it is more important to educate our children than to integrate them (can you believe what Washington will be like without Harold Howe II?); under the experienced (yes, experienced) guidance of Vice President Agnew the state and local governments will assume once again a greater responsibility in the governing process and a lot of Americans will be pleasantly surprised to find out that Washington doesn't know best after all; and the black community will find out that the concepts of black capitalism and self-help are a lot more than campaign rhetoric and that maybe the liberals really were trying to lull them into a false complacency by saying that they had a monopoly on improving the social welfare of the citizenry (Hey, that cat Nixon wasn't kidding when he said more jobs, less handouts!)

And Vietnam? Hopefully within a year the American people will finally find out what that seemingly nebulous phrase "an honorable peace" actually means. With the shooting brought to a close, Mr. Nixon shall make good (Congress permitting) on his pledge to abolish the draft. All this will be completed in plenty of time to convince Teddy Kennedy that maybe he had better wait until 1976 after all. The Nixon Era, which will represent the first right-leaning government in Washington in forty years, should be good for eight fruitful years, God willing. Idle speculation? Political fantasies? Maybe so, but then that's what we were told all spring and summer. Don't you remember? Nixon's a loser; he can't win '68. Remember?

(Mr. Brownell worked on the Nixon campaign staff during the 1968 election and had a planning role in the New York State campaign.)