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A Visit With Fordham University's New President

The Reverend Joseph A. O'Hare, S.J.

By David Heeres and Mark S. Kosak

Much has been said about the important phase of the law school's growth and development we are experiencing, in light of the building expansion and various other events. The electricity in the air has also reopened many old questions and created some new ones. What other changes will take place? How high will the law school's standards become? What specific actions will be appropriate in the aftermath of the dedication of the new building wing? One person who will play a major part in providing the answers to these questions is the Reverend Joseph A. O'Hare, S.J., Fordham University's new President.

Father O'Hare has an immense array of talents to offer in service to Fordham. His extensive background in philosophy, journalism, and theology will bode well for the roles he will be playing. As Editor-in-Chief of the Jesuit magazine America, for the nine years prior to his appointment, he frequently voiced his opinions on religious, philosophical, and public issues. Now, as he himself said in the Summer 1984 edition of Fordham Magazine, he has to be more concerned with making the university a forum for discussion and enlightenment of policies than taking positions himself. It would be difficult to find a more capable person for this function. In the meantime, Father O'Hare will also be helping to create and articulate the consensus with regard to the fundamental issues of concern to the university and the values which it should attempt to sustain.

Although his administrative experience is not as broad as his scholarly background, Father O'Hare promises to be a capable administrator. It might be further noted that he has a particular closeness to the Lincoln Center campus, having taught in the EXCEL program in the Lowenstein building from 1972 to 1975 and, of course, having worked out of the nearby offices of America.

Shortly before his inauguration on September 30, Father O'Hare spoke with us about his upcoming tenure and matters of interest to him. We tried to focus on issues which most concern the law school community.

On the Law School Generally

"The law school is one of the prides of the university... you can find its alumni all over - not just in law firms, but also in public service functions and in government. It's a very good law school, and perhaps at this stage of development it's on the brink of becoming a great one."

Father O'Hare said that one possible mode of action for further improving the law school's standing might be to lower somewhat the number of candidates accepted for admission. He is opposed, however, to any phasing out of the Evening Division: "I'd hate to see the Evening Division disappear...one thing Fordham has done historically in New York City has been to open avenues of opportunity to young men and women who are moving up the ladder."

Like most everyone else in the Fordham community, Father O'Hare is very excited about the upcoming Building Dedication. He added, "I want to see what the building looks like... Every time I've gone over to visit there have been partitions and I haven't really gotten a chance to see what the law school will look like."

On the Possibility of Housing at Lincoln Center

"We have property here at the Lincoln Center campus that is undeveloped which appreciates in value each year - it's kind of an endowment for the university. We'd like to consider what the law school community..."

KATOSORS TO RECEIVE BENE MERENTI

By Mark S. Kosak

On Sunday, October 28, 1984 Professor Constantine N. Katonis will receive the Bene Merenti medal for twenty-five years of loyal and devoted service to Fordham Law School. The presentation will be part of the University-wide Convocation to be held in the Pope Auditorium on the 144th Anniversary of the inauguration of Fordham University.

The University Convocation provides the appropriate academic and festive atmosphere for President Rev. O'Hare to laud the dedication of its faculties and to describe some of the challenges facing the entire Fordham community. For Rev. O'Hare this will be a very exciting day since this will be the first time he will lead such a ceremony, but for the sake of the University, hopefully it will be the first of many.

The Bene Merenti Award is given to those faculty members who have been with the University for a period of twenty-five years and has a very interesting history unto itself. Reverend Aloysian J. Hogan, S.J. President of Fordham from 1930-36 had the gold "Bene Merenti" medal specifically struck for the face of it a reproduction of the University Seal and on the reverse side the inscription "Bene merenti de Universitate Fordhamensi" and the name of recipient, with the years during which he or she served.

Professor Katonis, or "Guy" as he is affectionately referred to, has had a very profound influence both on the law school and its legal community. Professor Katonis has never been a stranger to Fordham, not even during his early years. Upon graduation from Xavier High School in 1949, he attended Fordham University and obtained his B.S. degree in Accounting. He later went on to receive the highest academic average in each of his three years at Fordham Law School, and worked on the Law Review.

The first of Cahill Gordon Reinoldt & Old was where he made his initial legal inroads after graduation. While working full time by day, he was able to attend N.Y. U. Graduate School of Law at night and upon completion received his LL. M. in Taxation and Corporate Law. These commitments did not, however, prevent him from becoming the President of the Fordham Law Review Association and being a Legal Aid Volunteer. The later position yielded him commendations both from the Federal District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals for his devo-

(Continued on page 15)

URBAN LAW CLINIC ESTABLISHED

(Students to Act as Attorneys for City of New York)

By Professor Harris

The faculty has approved the establishment of a new, radically different clinical program for Fordham Law students to begin in January 1985, to be known as "The Urban Law Clinic. This clinic will be offered in addition to the Clinical Placement Program. The Urban Law Clinic will permit Fordham Law students, for the first time, to engage in actual representation of clients under strict supervision pursuant to New York State Court of Appeal's rules which authorize such student practice. Unlike the Clinical Placement Program in which students assist lawyers, the Urban Law Clinic would permit third and fourth year students to act as the attorneys. They will perform the full range of lawyering tasks from preparing and planning the case to presenting it in the courtroom including oral argument and examination of witnesses.

(Continued on page 15)
EDITOR'S MESSAGE

Student apathy has been a problem at the Law School for quite some time. People talk about the problem, complain and even get into heated arguments over it. Discussions, however, are focused at the results of the problem rather than at the cause. Talking around an issue is not only unproductive but can be very frustrating and can even fuel further apathy.

To control the problem, attack the cause rather than ridiculing the result. You might ask yourself, at this point, what is the root cause of student apathy at the Law School? Unfortunately there is not one simple all-inclusive answer. But as a general proposition, it boils down to students’ preoccupation with their own concerns and inner world, with a resulting lack of feeling towards what is going on in their surrounding community. Students feel the emotion in themselves and see others exhibiting similar signs, but no one takes the initiative to bring about a solution.

Who then is primarily responsible for working towards the removal of student apathy? Is it the responsibility of the faculty, administration, alumni, fellow students or does the responsibility rest with you? In the final analysis I suggest that the burden rests with you. You and you alone are in the position to take the initiative to stop student apathy by taking a greater interest in your Law School.

To what extent does your responsibility require you to take action? To answer this question, you must pose an additional two: 1) What do you want accomplished at the Law School? 2) How quickly do you want to see results? If you recognize a problem and want results, define the parameters of it and work towards its resolution. Remember, you are primarily responsible for taking the first step.

When taking that first step, you do not have to necessarily work alone in obtaining results. Tell others about your ideas, convince them of the need to take action and attempt to enlist their assistance. This approach will not only alert others of the concern, but hopefully it will ease your burden in bringing about results.

For example, if you see the need for establishing a group devoted to giving advice on the type of courses which should be taken and at what point, given one’s particular interest, then take action instead of saying that it is a shame that such service does not exist. It probably will not be easy at first, quite possibly a frustrating experience, but with perseverance not only will you be helping yourself, but in addition others who share a similar need. When others see that you are willing to put the effort into a project, and in fact make headway, then they too might take the initiative and attempt to solve a problem on their own. It could become a self-fueling process in time. But for now, take the first step by getting involved and see what your school is all about.

Attend SBA meetings, join student organizations and go to Law School sponsored events such as the Sonnett Lecture featuring The Hon. Wilfred Feinberg on Tuesday, October 23, 1984 at 8:00 PM. in the Pope Auditorium and the Law School’s own Dedication Ceremony on Wednesday, October 24, 1984 at 10:00 AM. Attending these events will instill a sense of school spirit and pride which will also assist in removing student apathy.
The fact that membership in trade unions declined not only in actual numbers but most markedly in relation to the size of the work force in the United States. Union membership has dropped below 20 million for the first time since 1968. In fact it appears that total union membership is now approximately the same number as it was in 1955.

The percentage of union members in the current work force of over 100 million is below 18%

This decline is striking, but the more interesting concern would be the underlying reason or reasons for the decline.

A reason advanced by the leadership of the trade union movement is that the present administration has created a climate that is not only unfavorable towards unions but is in fact antithetical to union interests. Unions claim that the discharge of the thousands of air traffic controllers in the Pasco strike was clearly an example of this kind of anti-unionism, with all their sudden destruction of a whole work force in the public sector. This membership decline is viewed by the leadership of the union movement as a reduction in the free collective bargaining process.

The unions contend further that the National Labor Relations Board is stocked with management attorneys who are constantly changing prior Board policies and rulings so as to whittle away the rights of workers and to provide more latitude to employers in their efforts to thwart unions organizational efforts and to stultify the collective bargaining process.

Admittedly, there are causes for concern in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board and perhaps in the Act itself, but I do not believe that the Board or the administration of the Act is responsible in any significant way for the massive decline in union membership. Long delays in the finalization of certification procedures do produce a sense of frustration and disenchantment with the regulatory scheme. Further, the not infrequent reversals in Board rulings, occasioned primarily by changes in membership of the Board and not by acquired experience, detracts from the concept of neutrality that should be the Board's proudest boast.

The change by the Board that permits an employer to relocate a plant in mid-contract to lessen labor costs is regarded by unions as a method of "union busting."

FURTHER, The decline in the membership of the textile industry, whose story is the story of the union movement in the United States, is another illustration of the point. The textile industry states that 10.3 billion square yards were imported in 1983 which is 1.8 billion more than in the prior year. This resulted in a loss of over 100,000 job opportunities.

The apparel industry has lost 323,000 jobs in the United States since 1973. The reason for the loss of these jobs is easily demonstrated by a wage comparison. The average hourly wage in the United States is $5.85, in Hong Kong $1.18, in South Korea $5.63 and Taiwan $5.7.

Similarly, the reduction of jobs in the steel and other smoke stack industries due to foreign competition has contributed substantially to the loss in union membership. Membership in the Steelworkers Union is down 400,000 since 1981 and at present is holding at 740,000 dues paying members.

While there has been a decline in jobs in textile, steel and other industries, jobs have been created elsewhere in the nation as reflected in the ever increasing work force. It may be asked therefore why have unions not obtained members elsewhere in the work force?

One answer advanced by a labor leader is that the economic growth (i.e. new jobs) has been in areas such as high technology where unions traditionally have had difficulty in organizing. Persons holding such jobs do not regard themselves as members of the working class - higher wages and job security are derived by personal efforts and accomplishments rather than through unions. Granted that there are some among the unorganized who follow this line of reasoning, I do not believe that this explains the fact that 81 million persons in the work force are neither organized nor participating in union membership. This conclusion is buttressed when one considers the organization of public employees. In New York State the percentage of employees who are members of employee organizations is over 70% of the total work force in the public sector. This membership in the public sector in thousands of professional employees is based on the guarantee of freedom and rights, as the firm rock of a pluralistic society. The union movement must demonstrate that it is concerned about the dignity and welfare of all who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow or who would like the opportunity to do so.

Those of us in advanced years, recall that in the 1930's and early 1940's organized labor was a significant part of any movement seeking to deal with the social ills that then beset our nation - the poor, the disadvantaged - the homeless - the needy aged - the unemployed. Then the union movement vividly supported the war effort, the lives of our soldiers were protected through the Social Security and Unemployment Compensation. Such activism attracted people to the trade union movement.

A further question must be raised and that is how active have unions been in efforts to organize the unorganized. My observation is that the response to a roll call on this issue would find a minority responding in the affirmative.

I hasten to point out, however, that there are outstanding persons in the labor movement who are responding to social needs and who are actively organizing. Such a person is John Sweeney, President of the International Service Employees International Union. He is not alone though few will match him.

The lesson once mastered by Samuel Gompers and understood by his successors George Meany, Lane Kirkland and Thomas Donahue is that workers join unions because their dignity as human beings has been offended or is threatened.

In the interest of their efforts to increase the percentage of persons in the work force, the union movement must demonstrate that it is concerned about the dignity and welfare of all who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow or who would like the opportunity to do so.
It is an old and familiar saying for cocktail parties and the like: "Don't discuss religion and politics." If anybody doesn't follow the advice, be sure to take his or her characteristic mug of roasted coffee, and make certain that he neither wins nor loses. Today, we find our politicians (and our clergy) not only discussing, but actually arguing, over the topics. Led by Governor Cuomo, arguments and discussions have arisen between Cuomo, Governor Mario Cuomo, arguments and discussions over Cohen's anti-Semitism and the Church's membership. While this may never occur it is a right the State presently has and a right the Church should have.

Churches focus on three major issues when fighting for their beliefs in the political arena: abortion, school prayer and religious school financing. About the last, the Supreme Court has said that tax-payer money is Constitutional and now the legislature must debate about their usage. However, Pope John Paul II's call for state financing of religious schools raises too many questions for our pluralistic society. Do we want to finance a school for Reverend Sun Myung Moon? How about Ayatollah Khomeini? Bob Jones? A Satai cuto? Finance one and you really must finance all. Who pays for school prayer? School prayer is also sticky. Whose prayer? Why do we need school prayer? Why not home prayer? I wish to turn to my second question that liberals would champion had an interpretation of the due process clause of the Constitution, which is the day I begin to wonder about his abilities to handle these issues for the other side. His state of mind is not a logical argument; however, the denial of school prayer was meant to fight. Besides, children daydream enough in class; isn't it the fire and brimstone. However, in the mean time, the Democratic Party's fight for so called school prayer has not made it to Congress. Liberals retort that these movements produced emotional problem. If we don't like our rabbi can we impeach or take him to court? Neither the Church nor the Pope does. This alliance of Church and State is trying to deal with a complex issue, but somehow the whole thing has become a political and religious matters. When Ar- rived.

A call for strict separation is not only asking for the impossible, it is also flirtling with disaster in the 1984 election.

The dangers of a merger between Church and State go far beyond the political conse- quences. Even if he were to win the 1984 election, the Church still brings the dangers of a merger. Taking an affiliation of any Church and State is a political as well as religious being. For many years society will view prochoicers with a war on the wall which cannot be transcended once in a decade. (Jimmy Carter tried to gain influence over the religious right by stressing issues for the poor over other conservative ideas. This failed because it did not coincide with the traditional Democratic political agenda. The Church's influence has its Democrats scared because of the voting power of the religious right. If the Churches influence is increasing, some Republican strategists think that a marriage with the religious right will drive away moderate voters who would feel the Republicans had become the Christian Democrats (see recent William Safire articles for more on this).

Some Democrats see the Republicans em- barking on the religious right as a Godsend, feel- ing that both will hang themselves with their own rope. These Democrats believe that the religious right's moral agenda is impossible to implement and will lead to petty internal squab- bles. These Democrats also believe that moderate Americans will revile all forms of the fire and brimstone. However, in the mean time, the Democratic Party's fight for so called school prayer has not made it to Congress. Liberals retort that these movements produced emotional problem. If we don't like our rabbi can we impeach or take him to court? Neither the Church nor the Pope does. This alliance of Church and State is trying to deal with a complex issue, but somehow the whole thing has become a political and religious matters. When Ar- rived.
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The flood of new and innovative life insur-
ance products which began as a trickle in
the early 1960's and continued into the
torrent of the late 1970's, is not yet over.

These products were initially sold as
more of an investment vehicle than a life insurance product.

Some new products were developed as an
investment contract with an insurance
component to it. These products were called
interest sensitive.

Interest sensitive products were introduced with
the advent of variable life and universal life.

This was a revolution in the insurance industry,
as it marked the beginning of a new
era in the sale and marketing of life insurance.

The pioneers in this field were
the immediate family and
friends of the
policyholder.

From there, the products
spread to the insurance
buying public.

As the market for
life insurance
products grew,
so did the
inventiveness of
the products.

Newer products have been introduced with
all of the basic features of universal life except
that the premiums are fixed. This offers a more
predictable pattern of cash flow to the insurance
company.

Irrespicable life is a member of this
newer family of fixed premium products.

The earlier policies featured low premiums which
could be reviewed periodically by the company.

Later designs incorporated much large
premises and were sold with a vanishing
premium contract. Irresincible life was offered
first on a front-end load basis, and later on
a rear-end load basis.

All of these innovative products have
newly emerged, usually on a reasonably
competitive basis, levied against their fund ac-
cumulations. These interest sensitive products
were initially sold as more of an investment
vehicle than a life insurance product. Abuses
resulted when companies sold products with a
large investment element and very little death
protection. The goal was to regain lost in-
surance savings dollars while at the same time
offering competitive tax deferred or even tax
free yields. Some of the new sales techniques
that were developed, such as selling the pro-
duct as an investment contract with an insurance
element instead of as an insurance contract with
an investment element, however, were ill-conceived.

Eventually the IRS took notice: questions
arose as to the status of universal life as a life insurance
product and the protection of its death
benefit and inside investment buildup under
Section 101 of the IRS Code. Beginning
with TEFRA, in 1982, there was a clear attempt by
the IRS to limit the investment element of
life insurance contracts, particularly universal life,
by means of the guideline premium and cash
value tests. The Tax Reform Act of 1984 con-
tinued to limit the investment elements of
insurance policies. Even with all of the regula-
tions and scrutiny, the products are expected
to continue to thrive in the future and probably
come the cornerstone of the life insurance
industry. In fact, in 1983 universal life sales
made up 18.9% of the life insurance (by volume).

This was an increase of 64% in market share
over the previous year.

At the same time insurance companies were
developing these "interest sensitive" products
to compete with other investment media, they
also found themselves in competition with each
other in the sale and maintenance of products.

This was particularly evident in the term in-
surance marketplace. The steady decline in
mortality which had lasted for almost 30 years,
continued throughout the 1970's. Companies
found themselves putting competitive term pro-
ducts on the street only to have them replaced
a year or two later, frequently by the original
agent. In response to the cutthroat competition
which became commonplace in the early
1980's, several new products were developed.

The family of indeterminate premium policies
is a perfect example of the way the insurance
industry responded to the competition problem
among its own members. The benefit structure
of these products is the same in that of other
products; only the premium structure differs.

These products contain maximum guaranteed
premium rates within the policy forms. Initial
rates are usually well below these maxima,
which are set at a level which eliminates the
need for statutory deficiency reserves.

However, the issuing companies reserve the
right to change those premiums (up or down)
depending upon their perception as to future ex-
perience. The premiums are not guaranteed,
therefore, there is thus indeterminable as at ultimate level.

The primary reason for the existence of these
products was to reduce the chance that policies
would be lapsed and replaced in another com-
pany (or the same company) by policies with
lower premiums. Indeterminate premium pro-
ducts particularly term, are still widely sold.

Questions as to the status of the difference be-
\nthe actual premiums and the guaranteed
maxima, the so-called "phantom" premiums,

have been settled in recent years: they are con-
sidered dividends.

Reduction of the risk of replacement was also
the driving force behind the development
of "reentry" products, both permanent and
term. These are products which provide that
at fixed intervals or a fixed number of durations
the insured may choose to be reentered in
order to "reenter" the insured population with
lower premiums. Although they provided a
popular consumer gimmick, reentry products
are not as popular with companies now as when
originally introduced several years ago.

The reason is that the reentering process is very
expensive. In a time when insurance company
operating expenses have been rapidly escalating,
the products simply became too cost-
ly to maintain.

The last product to be mentioned, graded
premium whole life, has been in the
marketplace for quite some time. However, it
has recently come into prominence because of
substantial reductions in premium rates charg-
ed by its more aggressive marketers. The pro-
duct is structured as level benefit whole life in-
surance with premiums which increase annually
for between ten and twenty years. Therefore
premiums are level.

The product was initially designed to meet the needs of people
who should consider large amounts of life insurance,
such as young professionals with children,
but who can't afford the initial level of expense.

As their income grows, the premiums, which are initially low, grow and reach a plateau when
premiums are level. The product was initially
designed to meet the needs of people who
should consider large amounts of life insurance,
such as young professionals with children,
but who can't afford the initial level of expense.

As their income grows, the premiums, which are initially low, grow and reach a plateau when
premiums are level. The product was initially
designed to meet the needs of people who
should consider large amounts of life insurance,
such as young professionals with children,
but who can't afford the initial level of expense.

As their income grows, the premiums, which are initially low, grow and reach a plateau when
premiums are level. The product was initially
designed to meet the needs of people who
should consider large amounts of life insurance,
such as young professionals with children,
but who can't afford the initial level of expense.

As their income grows, the premiums, which are initially low, grow and reach a plateau when
premiums are level. The product was initially
designed to meet the needs of people who
should consider large amounts of life insurance,
such as young professionals with children,
but who can't afford the initial level of expense.
A DAY FOR THE DEAN

By Mark S. Kosak

The Fordham Democratic Law Student Association held its orientation meeting on September 19, 1984 and garnered 26 new members. Added to the 25 members still in good standing from last year, the F.D.L.S.A. membership count stands at 51. Many of our members signed up to campaign for Mondale/Ferraro, and I am sure their work has become evident by now.

The F.D.L.S.A. will continue to have its successful speakers program as the highlight of its events this coming school year. Hopefully, the F.D.L.S.A. will sponsor seminars on "Politics" and "State Government." Additionally, we will take polls and surveys of the student body. There will surely be other events as our bright new membership begins to exert its influence.

The F.D.L.S.A. will partake in a debate with its opponent, "B.L.A.A. Details will have to be worked out over format. All students are invited as this should be an event for the entire student body and not just the future "politicos" in the political organizations.

NOTES FROM THE F.D.L.S.A.

The Fordham Democratic Law Student Association held its orientation meeting on September 19, 1984 and garnered 26 new members. Added to the 25 members still in good standing from last year, the F.D.L.S.A. membership count stands at 51. Many of our members signed up to campaign for Mondale/Ferraro, and I am sure their work has become evident by now.

The F.D.L.S.A. will continue to have its successful speakers program as the highlight of its events this coming school year. Hopefully, the F.D.L.S.A. will sponsor seminars on "Politics" and "State Government." Additionally, we will take polls and surveys of the student body. There will surely be other events as our bright new membership begins to exert its influence.

The F.D.L.S.A. will partake in a debate with its opponent, "B.L.A.A. Details will have to be worked out over format. All students are invited as this should be an event for the entire student body and not just the future "politicos" in the political organizations.

Dean John D. Ferrick has his day on Saturday, September 29, 1984. Fordham Law School celebrated Dean's Day with all the pomp and circumstance that is due a homecoming celebration. The 1984 Dean's Day - Homecoming Committee was led by Michael K. Stinton '79 National Chairman and also included the following distinguished alumni: Francis J. Sweaney '79 Henry R. White '76 Christine Maiocchi '74 Edward Brennan '74 John Kenny '69 Thomas Puccio '69 Robert P. Whelan '46 Rhonda Kirshner '84 Ernest Hammer '59 Susan Glover '79 John R. Vavignan '64 John J. Leo '81 John Sils '99 Michael Twomey '74 William Glass '33 Timothy J. Brennan '84 Dennis Casey '69 Georgen Varen '79 Richard Callinan '69 Alice O'Rourke '79 John Kirt '79 B. J. Santangelo '74 Edward J. Guidardo '45 A. Daniel Fusano '33

The day's festivities began at 10:30 A.M. in the Pope Auditorium where alumni registered and had that eye-opening cup of coffee. The rest of the morning was devoted to attendance at one of three very practical seminars which dealt with 1. How To Plan Your Personal Finance; 2. How To Market Your Law Practice or; 3. Changing Jobs and Changing Careers. Each of the programs were designed to teach participants how to cope with and solve problems that practicing attorneys might encounter.

After a buffet lunch, in the Lowenstein's faculty lounge, two of Fordham Law School's most distinguished alumni were presented with the Fordham Law School Award for their exemplary service to their alma mater and their community. The two highly respected recipients were: Honorable John M. Cannell '33 and Honorable Edward R. Neuber '43.

Honorable John M. Cannell is presently Senior Judge for the Southern District of New York. Judge Cannella was appointed to this position on July 3, 1963 and began duty on July 12, 1963. Judge Cannella, a life long friend of Fordham University and maintained his ties by receiving an LL.B. degree from the Law School in 1933.

Judge Cannella has had an active career. In 1940-42, he was Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District. Following this, he served in the United States Coast Guard from 1942-45. Upon completion of his military service, he entered Civil Service as Commissioner of Water Gas and Electricity from 1946-48 and as Commissioner of the License Department of the City of New York from 1948-49. Judge Cannella stepped up to the bench and served as Associate Justice of the Court of Special Sessions of the City of New York from 1949-63 in the City Court, New York County, Court of General Sessions, Criminal Court and the City Court, Bronx County.

It should also be noted that Judge Cannella is also a member of the Federal Bar Association, Catholic Lawyers Guild and the Columbian Lawyers Association.

Honorable Edward R. Neuber, the second and equally deserving recipient of the Fordham Law School Award is presently a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York. Judge Neuber was appointed on July 23, 1971 and began service on August 4, 1971. Judge Neuber attended the University of Notre Dame and received an A.B. in 1937 and then in 1943 received an LL.B. degree from Fordham University School of Law.

Judge Neuber has been in a variety of activities devoting his time to the practice of law, literary posts, judicial positions, as well as, civic and fraternal associations. He began his legal career as a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1943-45. From 1945-69 he was engaged in the practice of law (both in civil and administrative litigation) as associate and later partner of the firm Chadbourne Parke, Whiteside and Wolff located in New York City. Prior to his appointment to the bench in the Southern District, he served as United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York from 1969-71.

Judge Neuber also served the bar as a member of the board of directors of the New York Legal Aid Society from 1967-69. He is also presently a member of the Practicing Law Institute, contributing author and faculty member of the Practicing Law Association, a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (chairman of the Committee on Federal Courts, 1966-69), the American Bar Association, American Judicature Society, Federal Bar Association, New York State Bar Association and the Brooklyn Bar Association. In addition, he has served the Fordham Law Community, Judge Neuber is a director of the Fordham Law Alumni Association.

After an inspiring awards ceremony an interesting debate on the Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Bill was presented. The debate was moderated by Associate Dean Joseph R. Crowley '48 and focused on the issues of illegal aliens and the consequences of our present and proposed national policies. The talented debaters were Joseph Sena from Tappan, Edward Mazzoli and William Grossman who is the Director of the Political Assylum Project.

The final event was a cocktail reception where fellow alumni discussed Fordham days past, present and future. Alumni could not believe how the campus had changed and especially noted the bright future of the Law School, given the impressive facilities which are near completion.
If you want to have an extra edge when studying, you should try exercise. Exercise reduces the anxiety you endure when studying and makes the long nights possible (trust me it's better than coffee). Four health facilities are reviewed in this article, but before I get to them I would like to mention one facility which is free - Fordham. Fordham has locked rooms and Community Court. A great park is a great place to jog. Additionally, Nancy Kistner from the Westside Y.M.C.A. teaches aerobic classes Tuesday and Thursdays from 5-3 P.M. Having participated in last year, I found her class as exhilarating as a four mile run. Of course, the gymnasium and Central Park isn't always available, especially when it rains); therefore, for your perusal here are four health facilities within short distance from Fordham.

PARC SWIM & HEALTH CLUB: 363 W. 56th St., JU 6-3675, 6375 67; open 24 hours except Sat., Sun. 6:45 am -10:30 pm.

Facilities: 60'x20' pool. Nautilus (4 machines), Universal gym, steam bath, sauna, whirlpool (space available).

Extram: Permanent Lockers ($12/mo., $70/yr.), Swimming Lessons ($185 for 10 lessons), Sustaining Equipment (8'30") (partner available).

Classes: Yoga, Exercise, Aerobic Dance, Body Toning and a Swim Clinic.

Comments: Basically an incomplete Y.M.C.A. Fairly clear, though the men's locker room could use renovation. If you are light weight this is your place. If you have a limited time you can join for 489 (that's until they meet a quota).

Y.W.H.M.C.A.: 5 W. 63rd St., 787-4400; $182 for the school year (see Dean Young, Rm. 103), M-F 8:30-9:30, Sun. 9 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Facilities: Everything (hey, it's a Y). Can't list it all.

Special note: 2 swimming pools (20'x20'), Free Weights (space available) and a basketball court.

Classes: You name it they have it (hey, it's a Y).

Extram: Thousands (hey, it's a Y).

Comments: A typical busy Y. The Y's strength is that it's close, complete and cheap. It's fairly clean in most spots, though because it's open all the time there are a few crusty areas (especially the locker rooms). The athletic equipment is fairly new and in good supply. For the price it can't be beat.

FLS NEWS IN REVIEW

By Elizabeth Hermida

The Entertainment and Sports Law Council held its first meeting of the 1984-85 year on Thursday, October 12th at 5 p.m. in the Law School's room. Brian Murphy, President of the Council, outlined the program planned for this year in an overflowing crowd of more than sixty people.

Depending on the budget allocated to the Council the following projects are planned: 1. Sponsorship and/or panels on areas of entertainment and sports law of interest to law students; 2. Publication of articles on cases and issues pertinent to entertainment and sports law in the Advocate; 3. Possible publication of scholarly articles in a journal of another law school; 4. Participation in a Mock Court at Cardozo School of Law; 5. Promotion of clinical seminars; and 6. Inclusion of a sports law course in the Fordham curriculum.

Last year the Council sponsored two highly successful panels. The highlight of the year was the appearance of John Maddock, sports commentator and former football coach, along with Charles "Chuck" Sullivan, owner of the New England Patriots to arrange the Jacko's lucky field hockey and the Jackon's blockbuster Victory Tour. Their appearance on a panel discussing representations of figures generated an enthusiastic turnout that filled Pepe Auditorium. Even though its scheduling to close to the end of the year resulted in a smaller turnout, the appearance of Judge Winn, attorney, music publicist, local New York lawyer, Rock 'n Roll entrepreneur, and representative of the Thompson Twins, on a panel discussing opportunities for attorneys in the music industry, was well received and well attended, as well as the upcoming world tour. In keeping with this record the Council is planning present two more panels. One of which will likely focus on theatre and cinema.

Also last year, the Council published a supplement which contains articles of entertainment and sports law issues. This year, there will also be articles published. However, that is not the only hope. The Council has very high hopes of a great year. For one thing, since 1982 we have not had a slate of members that are interested in the sport, entertainment or the sport and entertainment aspects. For another thing, the Council has very high hopes of a great year. It is the hope of the Council that if all of the above is true and the Council has very high hopes of a great year.
Three Fisted Drinker

A Kiss Is Just A Kiss....

BOATEUS RIDEUM: A LAW SCHOOL TRADITION

On Friday, September 21, 1984, students set sail on the S.S. Circle Line for a viewing New York's majestic skyline, disco, sumption courtesy of the SBA. Carol Ann pleased with the sell out crowd and felt that they agreed that they had a great time on the S.S. Students held true to their colors and tradition. That's right, folks, we are talking about in certain circles as the "booze cruise." But the event remains the same. Law students, a commingling and exercise their inalienable in the Boateus Rideum legacy was certainly event's history.

Whether it be dancing with that certain special someone who was not supposed to fact remained that the tradition was being archives.

Students, rocking and rolling on the monotonous law school responsibilities and felt background, you still could hear the echoes of briefs and never ending first year assignments will be law students no matter where you go.

On a more serious note. It also became of some of the impersonal attitude that exist let's start some new traditions and hopeful and far between.
BOATEUS RIDEUM: A LAW SCHOOL TRADITION

By the October Newsletter

Boateus' Rideum is an enjoyable evening of dancing, beer, wine and hot dogs sponsored by the SBA. President of the SBA, Carol Ann, was quite pleased with the success of the event. The 1984 chapter was able to assemble a group of alumni, faculty and friends of the law school. Some students were very eager to go out and have fun. The 1984 chapter was an exception to the general rule of the law school. They were able to forget about the interviews and enjoy the event.

Hey Dave, Nice Face

Let's Dance

Hub!
DOYLE ESTABLISHES $2 MILLION TRUST FOR FORDHAM LAW SCHOOL

By Mark S. Kosak

James Edwin (Ned) Doyle, advertising pioneer and one of the founders of the Doyle Dane Bernbach advertising agency and eternal friend of Fordham University, recently set up a $2 million trust for Fordham Law School. This truly exemplary donation will represent the culmination of the Law School’s three-year $7.8 million capital campaign. The two-year trust will generate at least $200,000 a year in revenue upon Mr. Doyle’s death.

Dean John D. Feerick, commenting on Ned Doyle’s contribution, stated, “This is the culmination of an unprecedented period of generosity by the alumni and friends of the Law School.” Feerick went on to say “Together they have made possible the expansion of our facilities—an expansion which advertises the physical need we have had in the past years and which will enable us to offer greater services to our students and the community.”

Ned Doyle, thus far, has had a full life to say the least. Ned, born in New York City in 1902, began his prestigious advertising career after two years of study at Hamilton College. While pursuing his L.L.B. at Fordham Law School, Ned worked as an advertising salesman at several New York magazines and after graduation became the advertising manager at Cosmopolitan. Later between the years of 1937 to 1942 he was the advertising manager of Look magazine and from 1942 to 1949 was an account executive and executive vice president of the Grey advertising agency. In 1949 Ned began his very successful affiliation with his noteworthy associates William Bernbach and Maxwell Dunne and formed Doyle Dane Bernbach Inc., where he served as chairman of the board of executive committee. Currently Ned serves as a member of the agency’s board of directors.

Upon Doyle’s retirement as chairman in 1969, the New York Times in an article reviewing his career referred to him as “Probably the best account man who ever lived.” Doyle a “super salesman” at heart was able to combine his unique talent with the creative flair of Bernbach and the marketing expertise of Dunne to produce one of the most profitable and popular advertising agencies in the world.

Fordham University President Father O’Hare, reflecting on Doyle’s prominence as an advertising pioneer and his sincere benevolence, noted, “Ned Doyle has been referred to by members of the legal profession as ‘one that got away.’ Nevertheless, he has brought great honor to the University and his school as a giant of the advertising world, and as the shaper of New York’s most important industries. One can only speculate, but I think he would have been a great lawyer, given his keen, analytical mind, and the passion with which he advocates a point of view. Both Fordham and I thank him for his extraordinary generosity.”

Back in 1961 Fordham Law School moved its 600 students and 26 faculty to 140 West 63rd Street. In the two decades that followed, Fordham Law School became a major law institute, and in prestige came a flood of applicants. The Lincoln Center facility was designed to accommodate a maximum of 750 students and 90 faculty. In 1981 the Law School enrollment was 1,200 students and over 100 faculty! In order to maintain its tradition of excellence the Law School had to expand and renovate.

Fortunately, plans for expansion had already been made. In October of 1980 Judge Joseph M. McLaughlin, then Dean of the Law School, announced plans to raise at least $3 million for a new building. However, the real force behind Fordham Law School’s expansion has been our own Dean John D. Feerick. Dean Feerick served on the original fundraising committee and has worked tirelessly ever since. In addition to running the Law School Dean Feerick has raised well over $7 million dollars. Without Dean Feerick, then, classes would remain overcrowded, faculty would be without offices, and the quality of the Fordham experience could only deteriorate.

Dean Feerick was not the only one to come to Fordham Law School’s aid. Generous gifts by three distinguished alumni also helped save the day. Recently, a 2 million dollar trust was established for the Law School by Jamaleet Ed­win (Ned) Doyle. Mr. Doyle received his L.L.B. from Fordham in 1930 and went on to found the Doyle Dane Bernbach advertising agency. The trust will provide $200,000.00 a year for 12 years following Mr. Doyle’s death. The new building will be called “The Ned Doyle Wing.”

Prior to Mr. Doyle’s gift, the expansion campaign received a bequest in the sum of 2 million dollars from the estate of Leo T. Kissam (23). Mr. Kissam was a long-time director of the Fordham Law Alumni Association and a senior partner in the New York Law firm of Kissam, Halpin & Gruenew. In appreciation of Mr. Kissam’s gift—the largest in Fordham history, the law library will be called “The Leo T. Kissam Library.” Finally, Judge James B.M. McNally, one of New York’s most distinguished jurists and the first president of the Fordham Law Alumni Association, made Fordham Law School the beneficiary of a remainder trust valued at $1,000,000. Judge McNally graduated from Fordham Law in 1920 and went on to serve in the first department of the Appellate Division. The new amphitheater will bear Judge McNally’s name.

Thanks to these and other generous alumni, the expansion of Fordham Law School is a reality. On October 24, 1984 the Court of the new building will be officially opened. Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor will speak and the Honorable William H. Mulligan will serve as the Master of Dedication Ceremonies. Also on hand will be Daniel J. McNamara, the President of the Insurances Services Office and chairman of the Faculty Dedication Commit­tee; Professor Constantine Katsoris, the vice-chairman of the Committee; and the rest of the Committee; Associate Dean Joseph R. Crowley, Professor Joseph M. Perillo, and Assistant Dean Robert J. Reilly. Both are dedicated to support your school and to congratulate Dean Feerick and his staff for a job well done!

The Hon. Wilfred Feinberg
To Deliver Sonnett Lecture

By Mark S. Kosak

The Honorable Wilfred Feinberg, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, will deliver the Fourteenth Annual John F. Sonnett Memorial Lecture on Tuesday, October 23, 1984 at 8:00 P.M. in the Pope Auditorium. The lecture series is being presented by the Fordham Law Alumni Association.

The Sonnett Lecture is one of the most prestigious and significant events of the year. Although the precise topic has yet to be decided, Dean Reilly stated that it will be one which is thought provoking and of current concern to the legal profession as a whole. Dean Feerick, commenting on the significance of the Lecture Series, noted that given Judge Feinberg’s eloquence as an orator and his brilliant analytical ability on the bench, the event should prove to be a very rewarding.

Judge Feinberg’s credentials are quite im­pressive. He received an A.B. degree from Colum­bia College in 1940 and an LL.B. degree in 1946 when he was Editor in Chief of the law review.

After service in the United States Army from 1942-45, and as a term as Deputy Superintendent of the New York State Bank­ing Department in 1958. Judge Feinberg began his legal career as a judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York from October 16, 1961 to March 17, 1966. Later he was a member of the Advisory Committee on Civil Rules of the Judicial Con­ference from 1965-70, a member of the Sub­committee on Supporting Personnel, Commit­tee on Court Administration, from 1971-76. In addition, he was a member of a task force con­cerned with updating the ABA Standards Relating to the Administration of Criminal Justice and a member of the Federal Judicial Center Advisory Committee on Experimenta­tion in the Law.

Judge Feinberg has also been involved in various legal fraternal organizations serving as the President of the Columbia Law School Alumni Association from 1976-78. In addition, he is a member of the New York City Bar Association, American Bar Association, New York County Lawyers Association, American Judicature Society and the American Law In­stitute. Judge Feinberg was also a member of the Advisory Council for Appellate Justice.

The Law School on this Fourteenth An­niversary of the Sonnett Lecture Series must not, however, lose sight of the ideals which John F. Sonnett stood for. John F. Sonnett was a graduate of Fordham and a 1936 graduate of the Law School was a senior partner of the firm of Cahill Gordon & Reindel. The lecture series has been endorsed by his part­ners and friends as a permanent memorial to him.

In 1933 Mr. Sonnett joined that firm, then known as Cotton & Franklin, as managing clerk to support himself during law school. Upon graduation he became an associate at the firm. In 1941 he joined the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York where he became Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney.

During the Second World War, Mr. Son­nett was Special Counsel to the Under Secretary of the Navy. Later, as Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy, holding the rank of Lieutenant Commander, he conducted the final Naval investigations of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

At the conclusion of the war, Mr. Sonnett was named Assistant Attorney General and Chief of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice.

He returned to the Cahill Gordon firm in 1948 and established an international reputation as one of the pre-eminent trial and appellate lawyers. A devoted son of Fordham, his death in 1969 was a great loss to the profession and his alma mater.

Previous John F. Sonnett Memorial Lec­tures were conducted by the following elite group of individuals:

- Hon. Tom Clark
- Hon. Cearball O'Daláigh
- Hon. Irving R. Kaufman
- Hon. Warren E. Burger
- Hon. Judge John W. Dingell
- Hon. Judge Robert J. Sherrill
- Hon. Leonard J. Kosak
- Hon. Griffin B. Bell
- Hon. William Huges Mulligan
- Hon. Benjamin R. Civettetti
- Hon. Lawrence H. Cooke
- Hon. Sir Robert E. Megarry
- Hon. William T. Coleman
Some things are better the second time around — taking the bar exam isn’t one of them.

Take a good look at the Josephson SRC Course and we think you will agree that there is no better assurance that you will have to take the bar exam only once.

No other course offers the kind of complete integrated study system which simultaneously builds substantive knowledge and confidence. With the finest law summaries and lecturers and the most comprehensive testing and feedback system in the state, you can’t go wrong with SRC.

Steve Kalebic
Michael Plunkett
Mike Slevin
Michelle Lenemeyer
John Guadagno
Frank Occhipinti
Paul Cover

WITH YOU EVERY STEP OF THE WAY
SUCCESSION TO THE MARINO BAR REVIEW COURSE
Eastern Regional Office: 10 East 21st Street, Suite 1206, New York, NY 10010, (212) 605-2060

TO LEARN THE LAW

Sum & Substance
Comprehensive legal study aids featuring:

- Detachable capsule outlines
- Cross referencing to each major casebook
- Sample exams with explanatory answers
- Complete table of cases
- Easy reference index

Sum & Substance Audio Tapes

- The nation’s most outstanding lecturers in the law
- 23 subjects available
- Mobility and study convenience for commuters
- A refreshing change from the constant reading of legal studies

Essential Principles Series

- Concise outline format
- Detachable capsule outline
- Review problems and sample exams
- Most titles have innovative "JIGs" flow charts

AVAILABLE AT YOUR LOCAL LAW BOOKSTORE!

or contact

Josephson Center for Creative Educational Services (CES), 10101 W. Jefferson Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232 (213)868-3100

CES/BRC Eastern Regional Office: 10 East 21st Street, Suite 1206, New York, NY 10010, (212) 605-2060
A Student's Perspective
Tax Reform Act '84

By Glenn Busch

As we reported in our last issue, the Deficit Reduction Act is massive. The principal purpose of this new law is to help reduce the deficit. The law attempts to accomplish this not by general tax increases, but by over 200 specialized provisions. Among other things, the new law attempts to restrict a variety of opportunities to reduce taxes through tax shelter investments and other tax motivated transactions. In this issue we will explore the Act's provisions affecting real estate.

DEPRECIATION LENGTHENED...

Before the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984, real property placed in service after 1980 had a 15-year ACRS recovery period. To cut back on the use of sheltering techniques, the new law extends the ACRS writeoff period for buildings, other than low-income housing, that previously qualified for 15-year writeoffs. Such property is now "18 year property" and must be written off over 18 years.

The new provision is generally effective for property placed in service before 1987 if the taxpayer or a qualified person entered into a binding contract to buy or construct the property before March 16, 1984, or construction of the property by or for either the taxpayer or qualified persons, if it was commenced before that date.

CONSTRUCTION PERIOD INTEREST AND TAXES...

As a general rule, no deduction was allowed for real property construction period interest and taxes—they're usually amortized over a 10-year period. Prior law excepted residential real property from this rule. The new law removes the residential (other than low income housing) exception for construction period interest and taxes incurred by corporations (other than S corporations, personal holding companies and foreign personal holding companies). These expenses must be capitalized and amortized over at least a 10-year period.

WITHHOLDING ON SALES OF U.S REAL PROPERTY BY FOREIGNERS...

Under the 1980 Foreign Investment in Real Property Tax Act (FIRPTA), a foreign person who disposes of U.S. real property interests is taxed on the gain realized on the disposition. Prior law provided for enforcement through a system of information reporting. The new law replaces the information with a withholding system. The new law will generally require withholding when a foreign person disposes of real property on or before January 1, 1985. In most cases, the amount of the withholding is the lesser of 10% of the selling price or the transferor's maximum tax liability:

OTHER PROVISIONS...

The new law also provides for:

* a three-year extension of the rules allowing 60-month amortization of certain rehabilitation expenditures on low income housing; and

* a requirement that the expenses of demolishing any structure be capitalized as land costs (even though that structure was not purchased with a view of demolition; this requirement formerly applied only to certified historic structures).

In the next issue we will explore the area of tax reform. It is widely said that the complexities of the tax code make April a nightmare for millions of taxpayers. Most feel that the system is unfair, that equal incomes don't pay equal taxes, that the rates are much too high—some say the country is ripe for fundamental reform, while others say The Code, although complex, the code has worked for years and will continue to work. Is a value added tax the answer? Would the Bradley-Gephardt plan work, or are we better off with the Kemp-Kasten proposal?
"The story of a man and a woman" July 31

Cinema II at 60th and 3rd, is a straightforward, serious retelling of the novel by Henry James. Although its story is one modern audiences seemingly might not identify with, the plot has not been trivialized or sanitized to appeal to what might be called current tastes.

Simply, it is a not-so-classic triangle, set in 1870's Boston - the story of a man and a woman both vying for the love of a girl. Olive is a rigid, middle-aged spinster and one of a group of similarly unpersuading Boston feminists. She discovers Verena, a young, vibrant girl with a talent for public speaking, both a protege to be molded to serve the cause of women's rights, and a human subject for all of Olive's repressed passion. Impressed with Verena's speaking ability and sincere commitment to women's rights, she persuades Verena to live with her, and, taking the girl under her wing, tutors her, and urges her, indeed, cajoles her, to remain true to their cause and never marry. Verena genuinely returns Olive's love and devotion, but she is slowly being pulled away by Olive's cousin, Basil Ransom, a lawyer from Mississippi, and a man who represents all that Olive has repressed. Moreover, he is an open, unabashed male chauvinist (as he would be called 100 years later). Despite Olive's attempt to influence Verena and keep her for herself, and in the face of Verena's own ambivalence, Ransom little by little insinuates himself with Verena, intent on prying her away from both her unnatural life with Olive, and her commitment to the suffrage cause.

Vanessa Redgrave is regal as Olive, and in this role she is a study in contradictions: rigid and angular, haughty and cold in her disdain for Ransom, yet tender and melting in her love for Verena. She is a remarkable actress, with her long, graceful movements and perfect carriage, the mobile face and alert, steely blue eyes, all reflecting Olive's strength of character. Her limpid, mellow voice has wide range and power, even in the softest whisper.

Christopher Reeve, with a mustache and a Southern drawl, is surprisingly effective as Ransom, although he may forever be better known as Superman. He masters the necessary hardness of purpose to do battle with Olive, and his love scenes with Verena are touching and beautifully played. But one wishes for, perhaps, a bit more masculine energy and brio.

Verena herself is the hardest character to understand, and the performance of an unknown, Madeleine Potter, although efficient, hardly clarifies the mystery. Miss Potter's Verena displays a headful of cascading red curls, flawless white skin, and youthful high spirits. But she lacks any of the compelling qualities of personality that would cause the suffragists, and particularly a woman of Olive's piercings intelligence, to sit up and take notice.

And one does not feel she is beautiful enough, nor can she convince us she has the inner spark, to capture more than the passing notice of a Basil Ransom. Verena is supposedly a talented public speaker with the power to stir a crowd, but Miss Potter lacks fire, spirit, or passion. Her voice is a little girl warble, her mouth earnestly pursed and her eyes round as a child's. It is hard to know what both Olive and Basil see in her.

At one point Basil observes to Verena that he thinks she doesn't really believe what she is expounding; but that it is only her "sweet nature" that makes her cooperate with, first her father (a faith healer who is involved with the suffragists), then with Olive and her group. So the film's Verena appears to be a woman who is ultimately malleable in the hands of a stronger will. Between two opposing forces, she will go to the one who reaches her last. Thus the film makes no concession to our modern dogma of the invincible liberated female.

The cast is uncommonly distinguished. Secondary roles are excellently played by Jessica Tandy and Nancy Marchand. And one must single out the remarkable character actress, Linda Hunt, seen briefly as a woman doctor. She is tiny and unbeautiful, but with her penetrating, sardonic voice and biting, intelligent delivery, she stands out as a talent.

The costumes and sets are lovely, recreating the 1870's down to the last detail. The rooms are filled with knick-knacks and the interiors bathed in a sepia light. The exteriors of the period are dealt with mainly by using natural settings - the beach at Cape Code and a glen in Central Park.

Although the story in some ways seemed to fall rather flat for me, "The Bostonians" is notable for several lovely performances and for its aura of authenticity to the times it depicts. It is a film that is definitely interesting and well worth seeing; a quality product in every way.
Letters To The Editor

In the September issue of THE ADVOCATE, Professor van den Haag advanced an argument for elimination of exclusionary rules in criminal trials. I found nothing in his discussion to trouble me in its pragmatic approach to criminal justice procedure, and in what I believe to be his concept of the civil liberties of our citizens functioned by exclusionary rules.

Essentially, Professor van den Haag would admit that under certain circumstances, the exclusion of evidence obtained by illegal means is an adequate protection of the rights of the defendant, and that the exclusionary rules are in most cases far too narrow. In the present state of the law, the exclusionary rules are too often being used to prevent the introduction of evidence which, if it were admitted, could help the prosecution. The analogy is most disturbing, for in the field of criminal justice, as in the field of medicine, the criminal defendant, like the patient, is a victim of the state.

Professor van den Haag contends that it would be sufficiently dissuasive to police misconduct to prosecute individual police for violating the Constitution, for such a prosecution would impose on them the public disgrace of their crimes, and on their heretofore tainted evidence. But police are not individual wrongdoers, and it is fanciful to equate their Constitutional violations with the misdeeds of pickpockets or arsonists. The plain truth is, in their professional capacities, police are agents of the state. It is the state which transgresses against sovereign rights in illegal seizures and unconstitutional wiretappings, and all police misconduct is a reaction to an initial illegal action. The constant command of the state, "you may not do this," is a command that confronts the state and stays with it. The Fourth Amendment guarantees the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, and to the people the exclusion of illegally seized evidence. But what other country shares America's concern for the individual?

We see a different America. We see an America which has everything to do with the ability to lead and to convince their heretofore tainted evidence. But police are not individual wrongdoers, and it is fanciful to equate their Constitutional violations with the misdeeds of pickpockets or arsonists. The plain truth is, in their professional capacities, police are agents of the state. It is the state which transgresses against sovereign rights in illegal seizures and unconstitutional wiretappings, and all police misconduct is a reaction to an initial illegal action. The constant command of the state, "you may not do this," is a command that confronts the state and stays with it. The Fourth Amendment guarantees the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, and to the people the exclusion of illegally seized evidence. But what other country shares America's concern for the individual?
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A Visit With Fordham University's New President

On the Role of Lawyers

"If the index of the success of the school were to simply be the positions of the graduates - how prestigious are the law firms to which they are being accepted - I'd have a very long list. While I see that as a very obvious and very real concern, I also see it as a very legitimate concern - particularly in light of the law school's experience with the admissions process. I think about the ethical and social dimension of the law firm. It's one thing to have a list of rhetoric about what you are trying to do, and it's another thing to be operational... if behind the rhetoric, one is only concerned about making the best possible jobs one can get, then I think there is a gap between rhetoric and reality.

When asked about specific areas of the law firm, Professor O'Hare's insights were varied. "I think that every firm is unique in its way. Some are more oriented toward corporate law, others toward individual practice. The important thing to keep in mind is that the ethics of the lawyer is critical in determining the type of work that they do."

On the Jesuit Influence at the Law School

"The Jesuit influence at the law school is for me one of the most important aspects of our program. There is a belief that the law student will find helpful in the future, something that is not just a technical skill, but also something that is ethically oriented. The Jesuit tradition stresses the importance of social justice and the role of the lawyer in promoting it."

Professor O'Hare has taught numerous courses as Dean Feerick put it with "Great ability and distinction." His influence has been felt both in the classroom and in real estate development. "I think that the Jesuit influence has been very strong in the way we teach and in the way we strive to be a model of integrity and service."

On the Jesuit Education

"The Jesuit education is a unique role of civil government counsel. It is not just about the technical skills, but also about the ethical considerations, the moral implications of the law. The Jesuit tradition stresses the importance of social justice and the role of the lawyer in promoting it."

Professor O'Hare emphasized his belief that the development to the Jesuit Center campus was one of the "wisest decisions ever made."

Katsoris To Receive Benc Mementi

Katsoris, a member of various bar associations and judicial screening committees, and an arbitrator for the securities industry and for the State of New York. Because of his exemplary service to the securities industry, the National Association of Securities Dealers presented him with a Certificate of Appreciation for his "Contributions to the furtherance of self-regulation."

In addition, he has been a Public member of the Securities Industry Conference on Arbitration, a group formed to draft and implement a Uniform Code of Arbitration designed to resolve differences between the public and the securities industry.

Professor Katsoris, as an advocate in such areas as Evidence, Torts, Accounting, Taxation and Estate Planning, has produced some very persuasive and often cited scholarly articles which have had a definite impact on shaping the law. To illustrate, his article which outlined criticisms concerning the imposition of a death tax on New York City residents, ultimately led to its repeal prior to its initial effective date.

It has been apparent from numerous discussions and personal experience that Professor Katsoris' first love is in the classroom. He seems to thrive on the interaction that takes place with the exchange of ideas. In this position, he has been able to build a relationship with the student body, and he has been a mentor to many students."

Urban Law Clinic Established

The clinic will offer an unprecedented opportunity for students to study the law by working on real cases, practice it and reflect upon its implementation. Students will engage in a full range of tasks including client interview, research and writing, and preparation and participation in oral argument. The clinic is achieving its multiple goals and providing in-depth training.

In addition, the exposure will require students to take an active role in evaluating whether the clinic is achieving its goals. The faculty has granted five credits for this course based on the excellence of other law schools and the degree of weekly work required. Students will need to demonstrate that they are meeting the goals of the course, which is achieving its multiple goals and providing intensive training.
Last year, again, more than 4,300 people studying for the New York Bar Exam took BAR/BRI.

4,300 people can’t be wrong.
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