Judge and Mrs. Groh were among the guests at the party for the Bob Groh Scholarship Fund.

Faculty Abolishes Class Rank

by Barry Werbin

If ratios scare you and math is not your forte, then take heart: class rank has officially been abolished at the Law School. On November 30th, 1979, the faculty formally voted to set aside the class rank system that has been used at the school for the past 35 or 40 years. This will go into effect as of the Spring 1980 semester. Under the new defunct class rank system a student's average, taken to hundredths of a point, was ranked according to how she or he fared among all the other students in the same class for that year. For example, an average of 84.68 might be the 25th highest grade out of a class of 240 students and that student's rank would appear as 25/240 on the transcript.

This old system tended to prejudice those students whose grades differed by only tenths or even hundredths of a point. Many employers who traditionally interviewed only the top ten percent of a class would base whom they would interview upon class rank figures. Thus, out of 240 students, the top 10% being 24, the student in the example above who ranked 25 would not get the interview by such and employer. Yet a difference of only a hundredth of a point could push that student in the top 10%, so that an 84.67 average might rank 24/240. A determination of who will be interviewed based on such a fine line was clearly inequitable.

Moot Court Team

Fordham's National Moot Court Team will participate in the finals of the 30th Annual Moot Court Competition, which begins today at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. In the preliminary rounds, Fordham will argue against Catholic University this afternoon at 4 p.m., and against the University of Virginia tomorrow evening at 8 p.m. The combined scores for the oral arguments (60%) and the Brief (40%), which was submitted in November, will determine whether the team will continue in the competition, which ends Thursday evening. Last year, Fordham's team was the National Champion.

Faces Catholic U.

The teams who placed first or second in the regions last fall are entering the finals this week. Fordham placed second, after N.Y.U., in the New York Regional last November. Fordham team members Andrew Tureff '80, Don Shuck 3A and Jacki Hilly '81, will represent respondent this afternoon and petitioner tomorrow evening in Marico-Wonder, Inc. v. Environment Genetics Laboratories, Inc. The issue before the Court is whether the Seventh Amendment requires, and due process allows, a jury trial in a complex patent litigation.

The House of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York is at 42 West 44th Street.

Att'y General Civiletti: Law and CIA

Calling for a system of checks and balances to curb the excesses of United States intelligence agencies, U.S. Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti spoke on "The Law and Intelligence" at the Tenth Annual Sonnett Memorial Lecture on January 15. Recognizing the government's need for "timely and accurate information," to pursue an effective foreign policy, Mr. Civiletti proposed a rule of law that can regulate the agencies without unduly restraining efficient intelligence-gathering operations.

The Attorney General recalled the "sobering effect" of the revelations of previous excesses and warned that "the relevance of the past should not be forgotten". Nevertheless, he felt that we should not be emotionally swayed when dealing with evidence of this abuse.

The current political climate has precipitated an abrupt change in the public perception of intelligence agencies. Despite this growing mood of the American people, Civiletti cautioned that "our frustration over the situation in Iran and Afghanistan should not compel the abandonment of legal restraints on the C.I.A."

Civiletti limited the scope of his hour-long lecture to domestic activities. He is concerned about the only sometimes necessary encroachment on the First and Fourth Amendment rights of United States "persons" in the

Trustees Raise Tuition Yet Again

10% Hike Expected

SBA Vows "To Fight Back"

A tuition increase for the 1980-81 academic year was announced by the Board of Trustees during the winter break. Upperclassmen will pay $4,400, an increase of $400 over this year's tuition. Incoming students will pay $4,600. For the first time, first year students will be charged more than returning students. Despite the efforts of the SBA Student-Faculty Committee to work with the University Budget Planning Committee, the Law School took no part in the decision to increase tuition. Ed Finneman 2B chairs the Student Faculty Committee.

In an interview with The Advocate on January 8, SBA President Bob Patterson described the SBA's efforts to participate in the tuition decision. Last March, following the uproar caused by the announcement of the $400 tuition increase for the 1979-80 academic year, Patterson and SBA Vice-President Bob Emmons met with University President James C. Finlay. Patterson emphasized that, if this is understood, the entire senior class will sign the petition (the petition is posted on the SBA bulletin board). Patterson also announced that the Commencement Committee hopes to hold graduation in Avery Fisher Hall, rather than outside, which is customary. A speaker has not yet been chosen for commencement. Any third year student who has a suggestion for a speaker or is interested in working with the Commencement Committee should contact Bob Patterson.
New Year's Resolutions

Happy New Year! Welcome to the Eighties! Tis the season for New Year's Resolutions and the Advocate would like to throw out a couple to The Powers That Be in the hope that they will add them to their list.

Dean McLaughlin: RESOLVED, that I will take the opportunity to address the student body on the State of the School and Fordham in the Eighties.

Dean Hanlon: RESOLVED, that I will completely rewrite the ever-so-woeful catalogue and get it out and into students' hands by August 1, when it can be useful.

Elizabeth Walters: RESOLVED, that I will begin to collect information NOW to distribute in the Fall so that people in a certain grade range will know what their chances are with regard to a given law firm.

Reorient Orientation

Orientation in the past has been a cruel joke. Orienting (filling out cards, listening to speeches, paying money, etc.) that should have taken a morning, has been spread over two non-consecutive days in the middle of the preceding day of class. St. semester, Fordham.

One of two things should be done. One approach would be to consolidate all that activity into one session, preferably the Friday before the Monday that school starts.

Better yet, let's have a real orientation. All the speeches and bureaucracy can be finished on the Monday before the Monday classes are to begin. Tuesday through Friday should then be an intensive introduction into legal method for first-year students. Entering students should be divided into small sections (perhaps the same as the present sections), and with the entire faculty participating, would be introduced in an organized fashion to some of the questions that plague first-year students and interfere with the important part of the legal learning process. What are the sources of Anglo-American law? What is community property? And another one could be spent on the workings of the judicial system — courts and trials. And how many students come straight from college wet behind the ears and with stars in their eyes? A day would be well spent introducing those students to what it is lawyers do on a day-to-day basis. A symposium of lawyers from various facets of the legal system could readily supply those answers and also give students a first introduction to their field of the National Teams. I was also told that while the Moot Court Committee would recommend 25 students, in any case, all resumes received would be forwarded to the faculty committee for review. This process per se did not bother me. The interview did.

The interview only consisted of four questions:

1. What is your class standing?
2. What was your legal writing grade?
3. Who was your legal writing professor?
4. Do you have any questions?

While I understand why these questions may be relevant (although I am not completely convinced that they are any indication of how successful you will be as a member of the National Teams), I vehemently oppose the solicitation of this information by students.

Letters

Dear Editor:

I recently was interviewed before the Moot Court Board because I was interested in competing on the National Teams. Much time was spent trying to determine whether I was really cut out for this sort of thing. After much discussion by an overly discriminatory system for gauging students' academic performance, I was told that I was not ready to go on the National Teams. I was told that I would be much better served by participating in the Moot Court Committee, which increased tuition by $500 last year. It is not a sin to give some answers. There are many questions which arise in the mind of a first-year law student which he or she will have answered in a year. Others will take three years. Still others will take a lifetime and there will be no satisfactory answers even then.

There is nothing the faculty can say to an incoming class that will make first-year (heaven forbid) easy. But they can make it less of a frustrating, gut-wrenching Chinese puzzle, and (prepare better lawyers in the process) by giving up their slavish adherence to Legal Darwinism and create a multi-faceted, comprehensive orientation program to introduce first-year student to their profession.

The 4% Solution

In keeping with what is now becoming a tradition here at Fordham, the Board of Trustees has once again increased law school tuition. This year's increase will be as much as $600, bringing tuition for next year's incoming class to $4600.

What is so distressing about this development is that the law school is forced to contribute to various services and activities from which it receives no direct benefit. These include the Fordham radio station, computer services, and the counselling center.

Wouldn't it be a result to injury, the Budget Committee, which increased tuition by $500 last year without any input from the SBA, rejected a proposal that the SBA make a presentation to the Committee this year.

Recognizing that this is a time of ever-increasing costs and that the Law School has a responsibility to carry its own weight, we support SBA President Bob Patterson's proposal that the Law School tuition be increased in an amount proportionate to the benefit it will receive. This would result in an increase of $170 per student (4% increase), instead of the $400-$600 increase mandated by the Board of Trustees.

May we be paying our share, but we are tired of being the "deep pocket" of the University.

A Farewell to Class Rank

First came the diligent work of the Placement Committee of the SBA; second an endorsement in a student referendum; third an endorsement of alumni; and finally approval by the faculty. Class rank has been abolished. Gone are some of the arbitrary and unfair impressions given by an overly discriminatory system for gauging students' academic performance. Gone will be some of the indignities of the interviewing season. Employers will still have to gauge abilities; Law Review will still have the capacity to choose new members; diligent study will still be rewarded.

Heading the list of those responsible and deserving of praise is Elizabeth Walters. We sincerely thank her for her efforts.

Maybe some day a Fordham diploma will be something valuable in and of itself, without a clause saying where in the class the student fell.

Why are students' grades posted by numbers rather than by name? Why must each of us sign a form before the law school may send transcripts to prospective employers? Why is class standing not posted but rather mailed to students? I believe the answer to this is because Fordham has recognized the students' right to privacy.

It seems that the Moot Court Board merely is filling an administrative task which can be easily filled by a faculty member — i.e. that part of the interview which probes into your personal grades and class standing.

I would suggest that the Moot Court Board base their recommendations to the faculty on factors other than which invade the privacy of fellow students. In my opinion personal information such as class standing and grades should be viewed by faculty members only and NOT students.

Name withheld by request

Dear Fordham Law Students,

I would like to thank all those who helped me in the preparation and staging of the Bob Grob Memorial Party. The number of people who helped was many, unfortunately too many to list here — but you know who you are — you made it happen.

Thanks,

John J. Leo
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Party Kicks Off Groh Fund Drive

by John Leo

Bob Groh, after completing his first year at Fordham Law School, was vacationing in Spain when he was killed in an unfortunate accident. In order to sustain his memory, friends and classmates of Bob set up the Bob Groh Scholarship Fund. The scholarship will go to a first year student for his or her second year.

The scholarship will be awarded to the person who contributes the most to making Fordham Law School a better place during his or her first year.

The first Bob Groh Scholarship will be given to class that enters in August of 1980. The selection of the scholarship will be by a committee of students and faculty with students having the majority of votes.

To date there is over $12,000 in the scholarship fund. That sum is made up of contributions from family, friends and classmates of Bob. Direct contributions have been asked and are still being solicited from the present second year class which Bob would have been part of were he alive today.

On Friday, January 18, 1980, there was an SBA sponsored party. All the money collected at the door along with a 50-50 raffle went into the scholarship fund. A total of $450 was collected. The party had beer, liquor, wine, sandwiches and a DJ, and everyone seemed to enjoy themselves.

Contribution can still be made to the scholarship. Either give the money to your class SBA representative or John Leo. Any checks should be made out to the Bob Groh Scholarship Fund.

Put Your Mouth Where the Money Is

For the sixth year in a row, law students are invited to work with the University Development Office and Law School Alumni Fund Committee in raising funds for the law school in the Annual Phonathon, which begins tonight, and ends next Thursday afternoon. Although each student organization has been specifically asked to work two evenings, all students are encouraged to join in this effort, and may come any of the eight nights of the phonathon. (Monday through Thursday this week and next week.)

Students will work with law school graduates, placing phone calls to alumni around the country. Each alumnus or alumna has received a letter from Malcolm Wilson, Chairman of the Annual Fund, and a copy of the Dean’s report. Alumni who have given $100 or more to the Law School this year will not be called. In order for a gift to come directly to the law school and not go to the University’s general operating funds, each donor must be asked to specifically designate his or her gift for the Law School. A representative from the Development Office will discuss solicitation techniques with volunteers before each calling session; sessions run from 6:30 to 9:30 p.m. Free beer and sandwiches will be provided.

Any student interested in working should contact either the student organization which is calling that night (see schedule below) or Jim Connell, Special Projects Assistant for the Development Office, at 641-6441.

FUNDRAISER BASH: Nearly one thousand dollars was raised at the Bob Groh Scholarship Party. Several hundred attended.

SBA Reports by MBS: Mailboxes, Elections, etc.

by Marybeth Sullivan

Two new services designed to help ease the serious communication problems at the Law School were also approved by the SBA. The first of these, a listing of all law school events scheduled for the coming week, was initiated last week. To have something listed on this board which is located in the lobby, a note stating the time, date and place of the meeting should be left in the SBA’s secretary’s mailbox by the preceding Friday.

Student mailboxes were the second service discussed by SBA. Noting the dire need for such mailboxes, SBA representatives were asked to investigate different solutions to establish the most practical and economical answer to this serious communication problem.

Midnight Interlude: Dean Visits With Night Students

On Thursday, January 17 Deans McLaughlin and Hanlon held their annual meetings with evening students. After the highly successful meetings with the deans in November, a petition was circulated among the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year evening students, requesting a meeting to discuss problems that might be unique to evening students. Also announced at the meeting, were plans for a Law School Cabaret tentatively scheduled for March. Plans will be made to a party to feature a variety show starring some of the many talented people at the Law School. Any student interested in either performing or helping to present this party should leave a message in the Secretary’s mailbox in the SBA office.

Basketball Standings

As of Jan. 21, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wins</th>
<th>Losses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1A and 4E were each given a loss due to a double forfeit.

CON CRIM QUIZ — What is wrong with this lineup?
Pen Pals: Reiss and Patterson Exchange Views on Tuition

December 3, 1979

Dear Trustee

According to figures recently released by Dr. Reiss, Executive Vice-president, the 1980-81 Law School tuition will be increased by a minimum of 10%. The purpose of this letter is to demonstrate what we see as the intrinsic unfairness of the increase, and to suggest an alternative financial structure which will result in a comparable net gain with a more moderate tuition hike.

According to line A 7 of "Fordham University School of Law Revenues and Expenditures," the Law School was charged $599,504.00 in indirect expenses for fiscal year 1979. Included in that figure are charges for a number of items that clearly do not benefit nor have any connection with the Law School:

1. Expenditures for Dean of Students — the Law School has three Deans of its own, all of which are financed by direct budget lines.
2. Office of Financial Aid — again, handled by Law School personnel financed by direct budget lines.
3. Counselling Center — service not applicable to, or used by, law students.
5. University and Alumni Relations — a service provided by a Law School office (again, financed under a direct budget line).
6. Radio Station — an undergraduate function.
7. Commencement — law students graduate in a separate, independently financed ceremony.

N.B. Not included in any of the above are plant costs or fringe benefits for personnel connected with these offices.

The 0.7% Law School proportion of these costs amounts to approximately $226,000.00. This is a totally unjustified surcharge.

The proposed tuition increase of 10% would result in a revenue increase of $414,000.00. Since the Law School should clearly be relieved of the $226,000 burden, a total tuition of increase of $188,000.00 ($414,000.00 minus $226,000.00) would result in the same 10% revenue rise (apparently mandated by inflationary pressures) need-ed to maintain valid Law School operations.

The $188,000.00 gap can be bridged via a tuition increase of $170 per student — which increase results in only a 4% hike for the already financially strapped law student. A 10% tuition increase this year would result in a combined three year tuition rise of 22%.

We regret that, rather than meeting with the University Budget Committee, we are forced to present our case and make our suggestions through this "eleventh hour" communication, but the actions of the Budget Committee leave us no alternative. Following last year's $500.00 tuition increase, which was decided upon without any input from the Law School, the Student Bar Association contacted Dr. Reiss and requested that the SBA be consulted before any decision regarding tuition was made. Dr. Reiss suggested that the SBA make a presentation before the Committee only to later inform us that this proposal had been rejected. Following this, our request to meet with representatives of the Board of Trustees to discuss the matter was denied.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

Robert E. Patterson, President
Student Bar Association
Edward T. Finnern III, Chairperson
Student-Faculty Committee

To: Dean Joseph McLaughlin
From: Paul J. Reiss
January 14, 1980

My letter to you of December 18th, 1979 contained the information that the Board of Trustees of the University has approved a 10% tuition increase for second and third year students in the School of Law; that the increase would be charged for day students and to $3200 for evening students. Entering students, however, will be charged $4900.

It would be well for students and others in the Law School to have an understanding of the factors which prompted the Budget Planning Committee and the President to recommend these increases and for the Board to adopt them. The major factor involved is, of course, inflation which is at the "double digit" level. The funds for personnel salaries, books, supplies, etc., needed to provide the same education as we are now providing will be at least 10% higher next year with some items such as fuel and utilities considerably higher. With seventy five percent of its revenue derived from tuition the University has no choice but to increase tuition rates proportionately. A 10-11% tuition increase is in effect a "stand pat" increase.

The cost of operating the School of Law is increasing as fast, if not faster, than that of other schools of the University. The current budget of the School is 17% less than that of last year, a percentage that is greater than this year's increase in tuition. It is expected that for next year the increase in the budget will easily be equal to the ten percent increase in tuition. In addition to the regular increases two more faculty full time positions were authorized for next year as well as the air conditioning of the Library. If the School was only 11% of the total funds it received from tuition, the students at Fordham would be paying $300 more per year.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Robert E. Patterson, President
Student Bar Association
Edward T. Finnern III, Chairperson
Student-Faculty Committee

Tuition Hike

Continued from page 1

Last October, after Dean Reiss indicated that tuition would go up 10%, next year, Finnern called Reiss to set up a meeting with the Budget Planning Committee. A meeting was set for November 27. When Finnern called to confirm, he said that the Committee had decided to not meet with the Law School students. Patterson and Finnern then wrote to the Budget committee, stating that "we are very disappointed that, despite our good faith efforts to work with the University — and our belief that Continued from page 9

Quinn's Students Suffer Deja Vu

By Burke McCormick

Second year day students who registered for Professor Thomas Quinn's evening section of Commercial Paper this semester were dropped from the grossly over-subscribed course on the day of its first meeting.

For many, the memories of last semester's desperate efforts to secure a seat in Quinn's Commercial Paper class were not caused by what should be a routine and painless task—registration. Ironically, several students who had signed up for Paper in the evening did so only to avoid the foreseen overloading of the day class.

According to Dean Hanlon, much of the problem is due to the fact that the law school lacks a lecture hall large enough to accommodate several hundred students. He hopes that we will have such a hall if and when the planned building expansion is completed.

The Advocate

January 23, 1980
HEARSAY

The Bob Grob party last week was a huge success. Many revelers were able to confirm the rumor last week that Leo has lost his mind. Considerate Andy Sims was the only faculty member to make a personal appearance while the ubiquitous Addison Metcalf also showed up.

Grade hungry students are displaying signs of the Rose Hill computer breakdown. Marks from the Dean and Professors Fogelman and Quinn are soon to be revealed.

Speaking of grades, first year students are still in shock from their rude Fordham awakening.

Students aren't the only ones who suffer the first year blues. Rumor has it that one first year teacher has succumbed to an appearance while another has resorted to calling on checkers.

While second year students are still reeling from first-year's romantic breakdowns, we are pleased to announce the following May brides: Dave Joyce will be tying the knot on May 28, Law Review doesn't get in the way. John Fieltikewicz and Bob Mongeluzze were also engaged (in each other), while Charlie Brofman finally got a ring for his fiancé. Mark Hyland was also afforded the vacation.

Professor Quinn admitted the other day that professors sometimes make mistakes.

Kevin Hoffman still owes the Dean some money for his spiritual guidance.

Meanwhile, on the cafeteria front, the glazed-eyed pinball shooters are also going crazy. Ed Henderson, who shot the second injury in as many days last Monday.

Biblio Turias: Fordhamites are still grumbling about the shoddy service of the dining hall. Line lengths were as long as ever this semester, and office hours are shorter than ever. Nevertheless, next year Biblio Juris can stay open later than 10 a.m.!!!

Finally, on a serious note, we wish Sharon Souther, Professor Hamburger, and Beth Walters speedy recoveries.

Civiletti cont'd
Continued from page 1

course of legitimate intelligence-gathering exercises. The need for secrecy and the rapid development of new surveillance technologies further endanger these rights.

Admitting that sometimes there are "intrusions of necessity", he feels that the "government need for information must be balanced with the individual's right of privacy." The United States should be alert "not to emulate the methods of totalitarian governments".

Finally, the Attorney General also stated that he would consider criminal prosecutions of hostile foreign agents who break United States laws. However, these violations are usually discovered through counter-intelligence operations, and the C.I.A. has always encouraged criminal proceedings. The agency is worried about the threat of "graymail" and the loss of a good lead if prosecution is advanced.

The Sonnett Memorial Lecture Series is sponsored by the Alumni Association of Fordham Law School. The Series is endowed by the partners and friends of the late John P. Sonnett '38, who gained international fame as a litigator with various government agencies and at Cahill, Gordon and Reindel, where he was a senior partner at his untimely death in 1989.

Previous speakers have included Justices Tom Clark and Warren Burger, Attorney General Griffin Bell, and Leon Jaworski.

News Analysis

Sonnet Lecture Less than Poetry

by Sid Grietz

The Sonnett Lecture is a unique event on the Fordham Law School calendar. Not only does a distinguished jurist visit and deliver a formal address, but he also mingles with the Fordham community at the ensuing reception, offering a rare opportunity for casual dialogue.

The rooftop lounge in Loewenstein provides a luxurious surround for such an event. Plush carpeting muffles both the background and the serious conversation. The skyline view recalls the backdrops of postwar Hollywood melodramas. "Stick with me and all this can be yours.

But as your vested roving reporter mixed with the members of the bar elbowing to the bar, he found that, despite the glamorous setting, the reaction to the Attorney General was not all that glittering.

Michael Sullivan, 3B, felt the event "genuinely uninspiring and insubstantial," echoing the sentiments of several faculty members who did not wish to be quoted.

After the Dean's customary bawdy introduction, Mr. Civiletti promised no humor. Although he managed to sneak in an ethnic joke, he fulfilled his prophecy. The Attorney General, who claimed to have cut down his prepared text, droned on for over an hour without mentioning much of substance. Mr. Civiletti dwelled on generalities and avoided particulars. He revealed no new information, proposed no specific regulations, and, in general, relaxed the cautious liberal analysis of United States spy operations.

Robert Mitchell 2B, observed that "the Attorney General merely outlined President Carter's policy which will eventually increase the power of intelligence agencies." He felt that the content of the speech was "simply political pap. Mr. Civiletti spoke out of both sides of his mouth. He originally claimed to propose a system of checks and balances, while the general tone of his lecture seemed to favor diluting the checks."

Students also felt that the scary abuses of the past are not completely buried. David Vaida, 2B, reasoned that "cover operations are coming back." Mitchell added that Mr. Civiletti said nothing to insure against the recurrence of operations like Cointelpro. "Observing that the topic of the Attorney General's speech was domestic intelligence and that most C.I.A. abuse occurred abroad, Howard Komar, 2B, reasoned that "he should have talked about foreign operations."

Other students worried about the perceived timidity of the C.I.A. in the recent past following the post-Watergate restrainers. Ed Finneman, 2B, is concerned about our current inability to deal with the events in Iran and Afghanistan. "Perhaps we now need to reemphasize the C.I.A.," he mused.

After sampling student opinion, I waited for the crowd of silver-haired alumni who were exchanging obsequiously ingratiating remarks with the Attorney General to disperse and managed to chat briefly with Mr. Civiletti.

Responding to concern about abuses abroad, he recognized that there is no legal control of foreign action. However, the Attorney General hopes that a renewed C.I.A. charter will curb agency excesses and that the command of contemporary morality will help govern such activity.

The Attorney General felt that the Hughes-Ryan Act, which compels the C.I.A. to report on its covert activities to no less than eight Congressional Committees, has gone too far. "That is no way to insure the necessary minimum degree of secrecy." Rather, he supports an amendment which will require disclosure to only the House and Senate Intelligence Committees. Combined with the personal approval the Attorney General which is also required, Mr. Civiletti feels that the public would be truly safeguarded against illegality.

Commenting on the F.B.I.'s destruction of surveillance files, the Attorney General feels that past targets of spying should not be concerned. He feels that those who were wronged will be better served by avoiding the embarrassment of maintaining such falsely discrediting information on record. Files with historical relevance should be preserved, however.

Mr. Civiletti hopes that the rule of law can restrain intelligence agency excesses. Realizing, though, that "the law is not self-executing" in this area, he promises vigilance by imposing his proposed checks and balances in the executive branch.

Bob Brauer, 2A, then cut in with a question about The Brethren: Claiming not to have finished the book, Mr. Civiletti offered "no comment!" and the Attorney General than left to circulate among the other guests while your reporter hobnobbed with the rest of the distinguished audience.

Despite the various criticisms, many including Vincent Briccetti, 3A, thought it was a "good speech." On the whole it was a worthwhile evening, informative, even if gossipy; "It's a shame more students didn't attend," concluded James Tynion, 2A.
Musical Musings on a Me Decade

by John Lennon: Plastic One Band
Van Morrison: St. Domenic's Preview
Pete Townshend: Diah Dunning
Allan Price: Between Today and Yesterday
The Ramones
Jonathan Richman: Rock & Roll With the Modern Lovers
The Rolling Stones: Sticky Fingers
Ronny Musick: For Your Pleasure
Todd Rundgren: Something/Anything?
The Sex Pistols: Never Mind the Bollocks, etc.
Bruce Springsteen: The Wild, the Innocent, etc.
Steely Dan: Countdown to Ecstasy

Talking Heads: More Songs About Buildings and Food
The Who: Quadrophenia

To the extent, the list does represent a cop-out. Originally, it was to have been the traditional ten, ranked in order, but the task of making such a list was too much for a little too much and was abandoned. A few fairly arbitrary ground rules were imposed in the interest of making something a little easier. Live albums were summarily excluded, eliminating steril- ing efforts like Reed, the Band, Ry Cooder and others. The list was also limited to one entry per group, despite the fact that twelve bands in the final cut put out more than one notable album in the last ten years. Some choices (Blonde, the Stones) were the popular favorites, while others (Springsteen, the Dan) represent a refusal to be swayed by sappy produc- tion and heavy studio hype. The list also has two art Rock bands and three Singer-songwriters, which probably means that nothing’s all bad. (All the same it’s a complete injustice that Joel is a millionaire while there are four people in North America who know who Allen Price is.)

The list also illustrates the fact that decades have no precise bound- aries. Dylan and Creedence came into the decade dragging the last bits of the Sixties with them. On the other hand, the B-52’s and Blondie already seem ahead of themselves and may ultimately be considered Eighties bands. It’s going to be a while before the next decade distinguishes itself as a cultural phenomenon, but there may already be some kid in some garage inventing the Next Big Thing. We’ll see.

SCHOOL OF LAW
UNIVERSITY OF SANTA CLARA
SUMMER SCHOOL STUDY ABROAD
1980

*TOKYO AND KYOTO, JAPAN

*OXFORD, ENGLAND

*NEW DELHI, INDIA
Emphasis on Law in Developing Countries. Academic Program at Indian Law Institute at Supreme Court of India. Students will cover Constitutionalism in Economically Disadvantaged Countries. Governmental Regulation of the Economy.

For further information, write:
Director, Summer Overseas Programs
School of Law
University of Santa Clara
Santa Clara, CA 95053

Say Hello to

Hot & Cold Sandwiches
16W. 61St. St.
between Broadway & Columbus
Breakfast served 7 am - 11 am
clip this coupon for
FREE 10 oz. SODA
with any sandwich
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The post-Watergate reaction has reoriented the lawyer to a shallower, more theatrical stereotype. While classic writers have incisively probed the shady character of the law (e.g., Dickens and Melville, and you can ask the Dean for others), Hollywood has recently added some damaging cardboard cutout images of lawyers to the collection.

The law has often been misrepresented by the popular culture. Television cop series often suspects anything close to their full constitutional rights. In fact, the network furluxx more violent beatings than曼达斯 warnings. The Brethren thus already outsold Calamari and Perillis, and John Jay Osborne continues to churn out his trashy novellas.

Thankfully, these examples are mostly mindless entertainment. However, three otherwise good films which incidentally malign our profession have recently opened to critical acclaim.

The Onion Field is a brilliant character study of the four parties to murder—the two victims cops and two psychotic killers. However, along the way we have terrible heartache dropped out of our legal system.

The film uniquely follows the perils of the confrontation from both the victims and the perpetrators’ points of view. Joseph Wambaugh’s story is particularly poigniant in chronicling the psychological breakdown of the survivor, played by John Savage. The two criminals escape at first, but they are quickly hunted and trials, takes the stand as a witness against his co-conspirator. The survivor, played by John Savage, has cleverly separated the two criminals.
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The Jury quickly reduces the sentence and the “heater collectively gasps ‘Mogil, the Warren Court has really gone too far.’

While The Onion Field’s brilliance lies in its exacting ad

Partial to four points of view, . . . And Justice For All has no point of view at all. The movie is a hodgepodge of Norman Jewison’s nightmarish, all presented in cameo order with no apparent unifying theme. Some scenes merely recreate the usual middle-brow critiques of the law: the anguished elderly man, graphically testifying against his wife’s brutal mugger, implausibly watches the cocky criminal receive only a suspended sentence; the ingratiating attorney, casually winning and dining in the pretentious rich client, misses a minor criminal appointment in court casing the sentenced but righteous convict to become a judge relaxes in the luxurious surroundings of his sauna and declaims about criminals being treated too lightly.

And Justice For All succeeds most when it descends to the level of absurdity. Pacino’s law bedfellow shows that women can manage to do anything. The ambitious young female lawyer who plays Pacino’s strange, neurotic heart. Dustin Hoffman’s growth with his character shows little depth, and Pacino’s law bedfellow shows that women can manage to do anything.
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