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Law School Gender Bias: How Does Fordham Measure Up?

by Constance Roland '90 and Joyce Stickney '91

Gender bias is an issue being studied throughout colleges, universities, and now, law school campuses in the United States. Recent interest here at Fordham was initiated by its hosting of a statewide forum on women's issues.

The Committee on Women in the Law, a section of the New York State Bar Association, sponsored the Forum on Women in Legal Education on November 14, 1989, at Fordham Law School. Students, faculty, and administrators from fourteen New York law schools participated. Selected speakers reported on areas in legal education affecting women, including, the hiring and status of women faculty, the classroom environment, and teaching curricula and materials.

In the late fall of 1989, Dean John Feerick established the Ad Hoc Committee on Women in Legal Education, a student/faculty committee, chaired by Professor Mary Daly. Other members include Professor Mark Arkin, Professor Hal Lewis, Constance Roland (third year day student) and Joyce Stickney (second year evening student).

At the end of this article, a Gender Attitudes Questionnaire is included for you to answer, so that your voice and opinions can be heard in this school. Whether you have a positive or negative report for us, your experiences and perceptions are valuable, and we need your information to help Fordham recognize and remedy the community's needs in this area.

Please fill out the Questionnaire.

Judge John Connell Receives Medal of Achievement at Alumni Luncheon

by Lisa Hayes

On March 3, 1990, at the Waldorf-Astoria, the alumni of Fordham Law School gathered together for the forty-first Annual Alumni Luncheon. The Chairman of the event was the Honorable Cornelius Blackshear. The address was given by the Hon. Thomas J. Merskill and the Medal of Achievement was awarded to the Hon. John M. Connella.

Someone at the table asked, "Who is that on the podium speaking? I'm not sure, but doesn't he head some SBA?' The person next to him responded, "How can I tell from that, don't they all?" Although said in jest, these comments certainly underscore the leadership that Fordham Law School has produced as represented by those alumni seated on the dais and those in the audience.

The oldest alumni were seated first, in the front of the ballroom and subsequent classes seated behind. This had a curious effect on the distribution of the audience. For example, there were very few African-American students less frequently than male students.

In the NYSBA Forum on Legal Education, speakers noted that women's status in education has improved over recent decades by increased enrollments, more women faculty, and a growing number of women role models and mentors. Although the improvements were noted, we were told, the gender divide remains.

Bernice Sandler, Executive Director of the Project on the Status and Education of Women of the Association of American Colleges, discussed the Association's research of faculty behaviors which demonstrate that female students are often treated differently than male students in the graduate-school classroom. Her conclusions claim that the male student is provided more support, direction, and encouragement than their female colleagues. For example, teachers call on female students less frequently than male students.
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No One's Corner
by Thomas V. Liguori, '90

"No one has the corner on the truth" John Stuart Mill, On Liberty

Fordham Gets a Loan Forgiveness Program—We Think

Just when you thought it was safe to go back into the water (cooler—a story in itself), the Administration pulls a fast one. My sources have informed me that, with none of the trappings that normally accompany a political move, the Administration has voted recently to approve a loan forgiveness program, for graduating students heading for public interest sector careers.

Funny, you have not heard of this either? Hmm. Did you go around from classroom to classroom gathering support for the Fordham Loan Assistance Program, the student-sponsored loan forgivness program? Well then, were you one of the over 600 students who signed a petition supporting FLAP? Were you one who first drafted a proposal for the Fordham Law Public Interest Movement? Well, then you were not. None of those responsible were.

I have no real ideas either, except that let me say what has been passed falls far short of any program for which you or I have been lobbying over the last three years. Given that I cannot go into the new program's details as none of those responsible has given me the courtesy of a telephone call, I have been able to confirm one thing: the only loans which are eligible for forgiveness are those made by Fordham Law—guaranteed student loans, college loans, and all the rest of those loans which will find us eating peanut butter and jelly six days a week are not included in the program's forgiveness scenario.

The fact that Fordham has enacted a program at all, I guess, is a good sign. With all the wrangling that dedicated students (and to them I give my deepest thanks) have put up with for the last few months, especially in trying to convince the Administration that Fordham has an obligation to try and help those who have actually bought into the Jesuit idea of "serving the community," at least there is something to show for their proverbial efforts. Are they pleased and contented though? Are you?

Those who supported the program as eventually passed believed (I think) that this was a necessary first step towards a broader program, once this one proves itself. Although no one will be helped substantially by the forgiving of Fordham loans, Fordham can show that it has recognized the problem of high debt burdens and low public service/interest salaries. And if we find that we can somehow afford a more expansive program then we will implement it.

There are of course many people who disagree with such a compromise. I don't know, but personally I would rather be able to say that my school was not yet ready for a loan forgiveness program, than to say that we have a program which has as its only benefit its publication in the Fordham law recruitment guides. I know many people in the Administration are as displeased as I am, and to them (who I hope by now know who they are) I add to my thanks. But I also know that many people are going to continue to go without adequate legal counsel, and to them I say I am sorry. Maybe Antonie Finch and I should go back to lawyerin and stop trying to do what's right.

Regardless of whether you believe that any program, however restricted, is a positive first step, or whether you believe that the only people truly served by this action are those trying to make Fordham look like a national institution in the eyes of the law school ranking committees, here you are: the Fordham Law School Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program (informally so named). I hope it works. But most of all, I hope it matters.

Continued on page 6

(L. to R.) Fordham Alumni President James Gill '56, Judge Irving Kaufman and Dean Feerick at the Unveiling of Judge Kaufman's Portrait Marking His 40th Anniversary On The Federal Bench.

Inside Fordham
The Fordham Law Public Interest Movement
by Tigran W. Eldred, '90

Bravo Fordham Law School! You should be very proud of yourself! You deserve high praise indeed. No—this isn't a reference to your high bar pass-rate, nor your excellent selection of business courses for the fledgling corporate associate. Rather, this admiration is for your sincere support for the public interest law movement.

For those who are unaware, let's reflect on what Fordham is doing to establish itself as a law school strongly dedicated to public interest law. A couple of years ago, there were very few opportunities at Fordham for law students to participate in public interest activities.

The situation has changed dramatically. First, there is the Fordham Student Sponsored Fellowship ("FSSF"). FSSF is a student run organization which is dedicated to funding and assisting students who want to work in the public interest during the summer. During its first year, FSSF raised over $20,000.00 and funded six students to work in organizations such as the Legal Aid Society and Covenant House. This year, invigorated fundraising will allow FSSF to finance even more students in public interest positions (for those who have pledged, but not yet paid, FSSF is still waiting for you donation—you are necessary for the program's success). Fordham Pro Bono is also growing fast! Under excellent leadership the program this year has been expanded to provide second and third year students great opportunities to use their legal skills to help indigent clients.

Many students have represented tenants at administrative hearings and aided clients in gaining needed welfare and social security benefits. In addition, students have been helping the homeless by providing legal assistance in area soup kitchens. Other pro bono opportunities include programs to help low-income tenants incorporate and run their own cooperative residences and legal aid for children.

The Latin American Law Student Association (LALSA) had its Fourth Annual Alumni Dinner on Friday, March 30, 1990. Described by one guest as "an incredible night," LALSA played host to some 50 people.

More on page 6
Letters To The Editor

BiaS At Fordham

March 27, 1990 was a historic day at Fordham Law School. At 4:30, a discussion began that was long overdue and hopefully not the last of its kind. The topic: bias at Fordham. Attendees included Dean Feerick, various administrators and many students.

Some students discussed incidents of racial and ethnic bias. Some discussed gender bias. Other students mentioned incidents of bias based on sexual orientation. Each testimonial added a stroke to the disheartening picture. Fordham it seems, is heartening again. For the third time it's happened again. For the third time that was long overdue and now is the time for Fordham to change.

Each testimonial added a stroke to the disheartening picture. Fordham it seems, is heartening again. For the third time it's happened again. For the third time that was long overdue and now is the time for Fordham to change.

It is much too late in the day to tolerate bias. Now is the time for Fordham to act. Now is the time for Fordham to change.

Free Speech: Alive And Well At Fordham?

Dear People:

I'm happened again. For the third time this year, someone has decided that the Pro-Choice button I keep on the front of my locker is just too offensive to be borne. He/she has assumed that the proper remedy is to remove the pin and to either keep it or dispose of it. Except, this last time, the pin was not taken. This time it was bent and twisted—just enough, I suppose, to make sure I get the point that my views please this mystery person.

Actually, this new twist is less disturbing to me than having the pin simply disappear; at least it remains displayed with the idea I choose to support in displaying the button. Nevertheless, three times is more than enough.

After the second disappearance, I put two signs on my locker. One said, "RE-MEMBER THE FIRST?" (Amendment.) You remember that one; the one that said, "Congress shall make no law . . ." (The other side was "pro-choice") It was a test to show me whether you like or not.

Both signs were gone before the morning passed. The pins have fared much better. The have managed to remain for weeks before disappearing. But this letter is not about disappearing pins. It is about disappearing tolerance for the ideas of others, whether we like them or not.

Recently, a debate on the issue of reproductive choice in the world, of people to display something repulsive to me. I don't have any more right to be the arbiter of taste to that country than do they. By the same token, they have no right to be the arbiter of taste for me, and far less so when I express myself politically.

Political speech and other manifestations of political expression are specially protected speech. For a reason. A democratic form of government desperately needs disparate voices to speak. It needs criticism; it needs unpopular views; it needs people to say "This is wrong!" just as much as it needs people to say "Yes! This is right!"

We seem to have a very strong tendency these days to assume that because someone disagrees with me, he/she is against us and is a threat to us. When governments behave this way, they are no better than mobs like the Create huge UnAmerican Activities Committees which did a great deal of injustice to both individuals who happen to believe differently from them and to their own spirits.

Why is it difficult for us to remember that this country we claim to value so highly was formed by people just like them. By the ones who are bold enough to say out. I decided to call the professor to see if he/she is against us and is a threat to us.

The exam period began and ended, the holidays went by, and the semester began in January. Grades were slowly posted downstairs as they came in from the professors. It was not late January. When the Insurance grades were still not out. I decided to call the professor to see if the grades would be available.

As it turned out, there were no grades to be posted. The professor stated that upon her arrival to school the week after the exam, she was handed a small stack of booklets. Somehow, somewhere between the translation from the test room to the registrar's office, some test booklets were lost. If you ask anyone in the registrar's office, they may say that they were stolen. However, it's hard to believe that anyone would steal Insurance exams.

There's not much of a market for them these days.

But, if they were stolen, the school should take measures to secure the safety of future exams. Besides, it is unsound to allow performance to be judged without an examination. If this is to remain the sole criteria for determining performance on law school exams, however, the school has a duty to the students to insure the integrity of the grading system. An issue which could be addressed in another article.

Needless to say, the situation was eventually settled. One week after my inquiry, the administration decided to send letters to the students to give them options as to what they would accept as a grade for the course. Only one of the options could have resulted in a true reflection of the students' performance in this class. However, this one was not available to all students. Otherwise, there would be no need for this article. Therefore, most of the students selected to have a "P" entered on their transcript as the grade for this course.

This probably was the best option.

(Continued on page 4)
Notice
Continued from page 1
I have gotten over accepting “F” as my grade. I felt that I would have done well in this course. I went to class each week, briefed the cases, and participated in class discussion. However, I have not forgotten the school for its lack of communication with us for over two months. The school breached its duty to us by not giving any type of notice as to the situation. When asked why the students had not been informed, it was stated that they believed the papers would still show up. Now, I’m doing this essay about the incident, as the exam was not given to us for two months, which would lead anyone to think that they would somehow turn up. If they were stolen, you would want that this is a reason to protect them. It’s just inexcusable for the administration to render a decision as to how they were going to handle the ordeal without at least notifying us as to what has transpired.

Granted, the school’s administrators have every right to make the final decision. But, there is no justification for being silent for two months to what had happened with these exams. What were they going to do? Reach a decision and notify the students when they mail out the grade reports. This would have been totally unacceptable!

Furthermore, the students are owed at least an apology from the school’s failure to communicate the existence of this problem. We did our part to fulfill the course requirements and the school’s requirements. The administrators must now fulfill theirs to us and must take steps to maintain the safety and integrity of future exams.

GENDER ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Data:
Male/Female: Day/Evening: Age:
Student/Faculty/Administrator: Year: 1 2 3 4

1. What areas related to gender, if any, need improvement at Fordham Law School?

2. What is your opinion or experience of the following in the Fordham Law School’s classrooms?
   A. Different classroom treatment for women and men?
   B. Does the classroom student response as gender related?
   C. References by professors to appearance of students?
   D. References to judges, lawyers, or other authority figures by gender?
   E. Classroom hypostylisms using stereotypes about men or women?
   F. Humor depicting male or female stereotypes?
   G. Stereotypes you find offensive?

3. Have you ever been disturbed (angry, uncomfortable, embarrassed) in the classroom, because of a gender-related situation or comment?
   Yes/No
   If yes, please explain.

4. Have you experienced sexual harassment by a student at Fordham Law School?
   Yes/No
   If yes, what happened and what did you do?

5. Have you experienced sexual harassment by a faculty or administrator at Fordham Law School?
   Yes/No
   If yes, what happened and what did you do?

6. If you were faced with a gender-biased problem with a faculty member or administrator at Fordham, what would you do?

7. Have you ever discussed your feelings with a professor regarding gender-biased or offensive comments in the classroom?
   Yes/No
   If yes, were you satisfied with the result?

8. In your opinion, is there a gender-bias problem at Fordham Law School?
   Yes/No
   If yes, please describe.

---

Flaherty
Continued from page 1
became an avid Yankee fan, will serve Justice Byron White beginning in July. Although clerking for the Supreme Court is quite prestigious, Professor Flaherty described the application process it was “easy.” The procedure required a standard cover letter, transcript, three to four recommendations and a writing sample. Flaherty was among ten to twenty applicants, from a pool of about 1000, who were interviewed by Justice White. “It was a straightforward friendly conversation,” Flaherty said. “In some ways it was like every other interview, but then again, it is the Supreme Court.”

Professor Flaherty applied for the position for several reasons, one of which was the experience he had clerking for John J. Gibbons, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 3rd Circuit. “I only have good things to say about my experience with Judge Gibbons,” commented Flaherty. “My year with him was perhaps the most rewarding and stimulating year I’ve ever spent. Judge Gibbons is a very respected judge and scholar, my contact with him was invaluable.”

“The Supreme Court would obviously be an enormously educational experience but especially for me because my main interest in law and history, is Constitutional law.” Flaherty hopes to learn, among other things, “the workings of the chambers and the dynamics between the justices and how decisions are ultimately crafted and arrived at.”

In preparation for his new job, Professor Flaherty has been familiarizing himself with Justice White’s opinions. “He’s known to be a justice who’s jurisprudence is hard to characterize. You can’t assign any label to his positions.” Although Professor Flaherty would not comment on any potential areas of conflict with Justice White, he conceded “we’re not going to agree all the time.”

It is uncertain how much interaction and discussion he will have with Justice White. “In large part it will depend on what Justice White views the role of the clerk to be. If he wants to be challenged with my independent judgment, then obviously I will make the most of that opportunity. When he wants me to come up with the best arguments and research to reach an end he desires, then it will be my job to do that. However, anticipate offering my views on a subject informally.”

If Professor Flaherty needs any advice he can consult with another Fordham professor, Bruce Green. Green, who has taught at Fordham for five years, clerked for Justice Thurgood Marshall during the 1982-1983 session. “I was especially pleased to have been chosen by Justice Marshall because our views are quite different and he is an extraordinary historical figure,” commented Green.

Professor Green described his clerking experience as “an enriching and exciting experience. It was especially interesting and rewarding as a law student, my job to do that. However, anticipate offering my views on a subject informally.”

Gender
Continued from page 1
program’s success this year indicates that even in 1990, women need to address and discuss women’s issues. FLW has assisted our research in assessing the scope of the student pressure at Fordham. Gina Calabrese, co-chair of FLW, provided the minutes of the Gender Bias Brownbag held at Fordham on March 13, 1990. Comments from FLW members confirm Sandor’s observations and include student habits reflecting gender bias. For example, some professors make an effort to use a gender-neutral hypothetical, but in discussion, their students, male and female, reverse the gender-neutral to gender-specific.

An inspiring and upbeat report was delivered at the November NYSSBA forum by Columbia’s Law School’s Professor Mark Barenberg. Columbia’s answer to gender-bias problems was well-organized and successful. Columbia researched its law school community and then delivered its gender-bias report to both the faculty and the student body. Professor Barenberg reported that the results of their effort were increased respect between the genders and between the administration, faculty and students. Columbia canvassed its student/faculty community and compiled written anecdotes reflecting gender bias in its classrooms, meeting rooms, and social gatherings. Problems cited were derogatory humor pictured at women, use of sexist stereotypes in classroom hypotheticals, inappropriate personal references aimed at the students and faculty, and similar stories of sexism and unfairness. The written responses became an educational tool to remedy gender bias, to increase awareness of women’s status in the law community, and to open communication among faculty and students.

At Fordham Law, the 1989-90 full-time faculty has an encouraging 14 women to 36 men ratio. The increase of women in the available pool of candidates since 1980 demonstrates Fordham’s success for leadership positions in legal education. Since 1980, there have been 24 hires of full-time faculty, 13 men and 11 women. Administrative hires (deans, directors, as- similated) since 1980 total 11, and include 7 women and 4 men.

Dean Feerick has opened the door to nallyse ourselves at the Fordham community. The Advocate’s continued development leaves a note on the desk in room 9, or come in and talk to the nice man behind the desk.

The Advocate needs articles from students and Professors.

Alumni
Continued from page 1
Americans, Asians, or Latin-Americans until about mid-way through the classroom.

The same holds true for the number of women represented. Hopefully, the student population becomes more diverse, to justice.

The Class of 1948-The Golden Jubilee Class was asked to stand and be recognized, as was the Silver Jubilee Class–The Class of 1965. Dean Feerick gave an amusing speech describing changes that have taken place since the class of 1948 and 1965 entered school. For example, tuition was less than $300 in 1940 and $2,000 in 1965. President O’Hare, in his address, talked about his experiences as part of a team that visited San Salvador to inquire into the assassinations of Jesuit priests’ last year. The team met with leaders in the government, the Supreme Court of San Salvador and the Special Investigative Unit. Eight members of the military were charged but acquitted in their trial after being given the order. President O’Hare stated that the real issue is whether the intellectual authors of the crime will be brought to justice.

Overall, the luncheon was an upbeat affair and I encourage students to attend next year if they can. By far, the Student Leadership Fund has again raised their vision. Afterwards, President O’Hare remarked the “kiddie” table composed of representatives of Fordham Law School’s impressive leadership, and was filled with the most delightful and amusing set of people in the ballroom.

---

Feel free to answer this questionnaire on a separate paper.

WHEN YOU ARE FINISHED:
Please leave your questionnaire responses in the envelope on the Advocate’s office door (Cafeteria level, across from the mail boxes).
At different moments of its quarter-century history, the Labor and Employment Opportunity Commission or "EEOC" has been the fearsome scourge of discriminat-
ing employers, a toothless tiger mired in bureaucratic delay, or the helpless pris-
oner of presidential politics. These vari-
able images reflect one constant: the agency's primary role as policymaker, in-
vestigator, and conciliator for employ-
ment discrimination disputes across the na-
tion. As a lawyer representing manage-
ment and, later, discrimination plaintiffs, I saw each of these faces of EEOC. But as a law professor hired by the agency to serve as one of its independent hearing of-
ers, I have witnessed still another EEOC: the enfant de combat, the enfant terrible, the en-
fant terrible of public administration, the en-
fant terrible of bureaucracy. I have no doubt that I saw the ensemble of the agency in all its forms.

When I was asked to write this piece for the Advocate, I recognized the possi-
bility that public discussion of my decade as an EEOC hearing officer might result in the termination of that high profile en-
thusiastic engagement. I concluded, as you gather, that concerns about this possibility were outweighed by the opportunity to in-
form Fordham students of an important way in which they might significantly con-
tribute to the profession.

Just like the Postal Service, TVA, or the Air Force, EEOC is prohibited by Sec-
tion 717 of the statute that creates it, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, from discriminating against its own employees on grounds of race, sex, religion, or national

origin. Another statute bars it from discriminating on the basis of age; and EEOC also violates the law by retailing against employees who file charges against it or who oppose its allegedly dis-

criminatory practices less formally. When one of its sister federal agencies is accused of employment discrimination, EEOC supplies its own employees to conduct hearings; it confers from alleged harassment, retal-

iatious, hands of insensitive supervisors, or the GS-12 perpetual EEOC supervisory candidate in Charlotte, turned down every time be-
cause of her religious persuasion (she could tell that they didn't like her turban) or re-

taliation. As I visited EEOC field offices around the country, two things stood out.

First, if their Washington chieftains were indifferent, these people cared. If only the Agency would stop sabotaging its mission by ruining their morale, these people would be titans of law enforcement—just ask them. Second, whatever they com-

plained of, wasn’t often race discrimina-
tion, unless they happened to be white.

Was race discrimination so seldom al-
gerated because of a lack of discrimination? Or was this a reflection of the fact that Agency supervision and management were, like most of the lower-level work-

force, preposterously black? Whatever the case, the complaints were black the charge would far more likely be sex

national origin, religious, or age discrimi-
nation (for that perennial favorite, retal-

iation), than race. Similarly, there were sur-

prisingly few charges of garden variety sexual discrimination, since the complainant and the allegedly offending representative of agency management were often of the same gender.

If you're starting to think that I didn't take these charges seriously, please think again. At one time during my tenure, it was reported that only about 8% of all

direct federal employee charges of discrimina-
tion were investigated. Even if the Agency's of-

ficers dismissed most discrimination charges as disguised complaints about something else, end-runs to avoid the limi-
tations of the federal civil service griev-

ance system, and was the defendant in a suit in which we

lost? I don’t know. That’s my specialty—I do it all the time." (Gulp). I met with him at his office and began taking some personal

paperwork. It was not a great experience, but tax audits was very favorable. When the broker referred another one of her custom-
ers to me for a real estate closing, I realized I could earn a living without having a senior associate giving me research as-
signments.

Unknown to me, my partner also had been doing some work on the side. But the few clients we had between the two of us would not have generated nearly enough to pay our overhead. Fortunately, my partner had been involved in one of those endless mega-litigations at the Wall Street firm. He was able to persuade the client’s in-house counsel to let him con-
tinue with his aspect of the discovery pro-
ceedings. The Wall Street firm generously consented to the arrangement. It was a sad day at the firm, Ray Lewis Jr. at work when that case settled.

That first year we just covered expenses—we survived by spending our sav-
ings. But in time, "word of mouth" began to grow.

Clients continued to come from the most unlikely sources. One of our clients was a former employee in a suit in which we represented the plaintiff. After the suit settled he called us because he was impressed with the way in which we handled the case. Later, a very casual friend from the Wall Street firm became a member of his cooperative’s board of directors. He suggested to his fellow directors that the co-op use us as corporate counsel and sud-

denly we were representing our first co-

op. The Board proceeded to fire the man-
gaging agent for incompetence (most of the board had not satisfied with their agents). That first managing agent had also been impressed with us and began using our services—and more importantly, referring us to his other buildings. We were referred to about ten cooperatives in that neighbor-

hood alone. Then an employee of that managing agent referred us to his uncle who owns a huge manufacturing concern in Queens. We represent that concern in five different litigations. Clients arrive in the most roundabout ways.

A few years ago we left the adjoining space in our building and added another office (for our associate) and a confer-

ence room.

Although we’ve been in business for six years, I realize that when you have your own business you’re never “out-of-

the-woods.” Perhaps that is because if things are going well, you’re expanding or wanting more. In any event, I wouldn’t

trade my experience for anything.

Some do’s and don’ts of starting your own firm:

Don’t:

1. Underestimate the cost of acquiring an office lease and customizing the space.
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At The Theatre

Grand Hotel
by John Caminiti

When Grand Hotel opened on Broadway last fall, everyone wondered how this classic movie drama would survive the transition to an up-to-date musical. Well the answer is, superbly.

The play is based on Vicki Baum's novel and the action takes place in Berlin's poshest hotel. The plot follows the schemes and plots of the characters as they encounter love, lust, bankruptcy, jarcency, birth, and murder during their stay at the hotel. The play's overriding theme is that no matter what happens, joyous or tragic, life goes on, and it should not only be enjoyed, but celebrated. 

It's Tom Towers' choreography and costumes capture the excitement of Berlin when it was the 'capital' of Europe. The elegant costumes are reminiscent of that glamorous era. The musical score is enjoyable and the acting, as usual, is yeilded, and best的表现 comes when Miss Normam delivers her one and only line. Her sultry gracefulness reminds us of why she was once the star of the Folies Bergeres.

David Carol provides the play's strongest voice as he charms the audience with his acrobatic dance number, commenting on the love of life and death. Karen Aker's portrayal of the ballerina, whose love for her boss will never be returned, shows us why her world-wide reputation is always a sell-out.

The supporting cast is excellent. The chambermaid gives us some humorous moments as she quietly observes the liltles of the rich and famous guests, who neither acknowledge nor appreciate her hard work. The dishwasher earns the audience's respect with his wife as she delivers their first child. And most of all, the dynamic dancing duo, who seem to glide on air as they provide the set's constant motion. They make brazen sexuality in the lives of the sick, de-pitting life and death, and their Grand W fte that ends the play is some of the finest dancing ever seen on the stage.

So when you body is tired from torturing your vision is blurred from banktaking you to the Martin Beck Theater check in to Grand Hotel, and see one of the best seasons on Broadway in years.

Jessye Norman at the Met
Jessye Norman, one of the most acclaimed sopranos of our time, performed on March 7 her only New York City recital for 1990. In a program that spanned three centuries of lyrical tradition, Miss Norman clearly demonstrated the caliber and depth of her extraordinary talents. The first half of the performance included selections from Purcell and Brahms. Miss Norman was however most impressive in her rendition of Rabe's "Lieder eines fahrenden Gesellen." Quarter applause from the sold-out audience followed a particularly moving interpretation of "Die zwei blauen Augen." That is, this is the first time program was intended for an additional thirty minutes by public demand. Miss Norman first returned with Mr. Spencer in an exquisite rendition of his "Jesu, Joy of Man's desiring." This was followed by a short piece from Bizet's "Carmen." In her final appearance, Miss Norman delivered her most unhibited and thrilling performance of a contemporary opera song: "He Has the Whole World in His Hands." Miss Norman will appear later this season as Sieglinde in the Metropolitan Opera's production of Wagner's "Die Walküre."

Movement

Continued from page 2

The Fordham Public Service Project continues to surpass all expectations and to prove that Fordham students are chairable in ways beyond their professional calling. Every Monday night, students prepare sandwiches for the homeless across the street at St. Paul's Church. In addition, for two weeks in the winter, Fordham students act as chaperons and spend one night at the St. Paul's Woman's Shelter. Many other volunteer activities exist, including work with the elderly, the Saturday children's program, tutoring the illiterate, animal blood donor drives and work in area hospitals.

The Public Service Project has not limited itself to the metropolitan region. This year, more than twenty-two students spent their Spring Break in the Appalachian mountains, helping to build low-income housing for the poor. While similar programs had existed at Rose Hill for several years, this is the first time that law school students participated. (See article in this Advocate)

FSPF, Pro Bono and the Public Service Project are leading the way in the public interest movement. Many other initiatives, however, have been under way and deserve recognition.

Fordham finally has developed a law school loan assistance program. While the program still is not clear, nothing is more important in the long run to the development of law students interested in public interest work. The program will allow law students to take the yoke of educational loans. Hopefully, strong student (over 650 students signed a petition in the fall) and faculty support will combine to rapidly make this program workable and effective, despite its limitations (See No one's corner: Fordham gets a loan for-
EEOC

Continued from page 5

vance procedure. Not me—I recommend findings of discrimination and remedies in something like 20% of the cases I hear, qualifying me as something of a minor thorn in the side of EEOC management.

But yes, you'll wonder with justice, what about the other 80%? All I can respond, by way of conjecture, is that it's important to consider your complainant. These are people whose assigned duty is to investigate or conciliate allegations of employment discrimination. For them, every wisp of smoke preages a raging Vance procedure. Not me—I recommend discrimination. Even more important, medies in something like know themselves experts in the insidiousness, I heard, qualifying me as some hing of a thing.

Investigators, with no formal legal training, know they know the law, and they consider themselves experts in the insidiousness, persuasiveness and subtlety of employment discrimination. Even more important, they know the procedures for filing internal complaints. They know they'll get time off with pay from the urdium of form filling while they testify on their own behalf or in the cases of comrades whom they informally "represent"; and they know what misery hearing officers like me will inflict on their superiors if there's any suggestion that they were punished for asserting their rights. They also know the procedures for filing inter-

For one thing, to its great credit, the Agency displayed enough respect for the integrity of this system of captive, defendant-paid witnesses of the Agency's chief witness and thus absolved the Agency of liability; and on the assumption of liability, there are the complainants' ceaseless efforts to try their cases ex parte over the telephone in advance of the hearing. There are the tearful recriminations of distraught witnesses about vendettas directed against them by Agency management with the assistance of the KGB or agents of Satan.

Finally, there's the unforgettable day that the EEOC's chief witness, a district director, steadfastly denied that his turning down the complainant for a high-ranking position had anything to do with the complainant's confession several weeks previously that he had criminally set fire to the office of a recently deceased co-worker. Indeed, the Director testified, he hadn't even reprimanded the complainant for this admitted act of arson, let alone reported it to the police. Nor, the Director insisted, had he rejected the complainant, and selected someone else of the Director's own protected group, because of race or national origin. Rather, purporting to rely on the candidates' historical performance evaluations, the Director said he had elevated the selectee solely because the complainant was marginally less qualified on paper. You decide that one!

To my mind, few things are as important to our nation's well being as the vigorous, balanced and conscientious enforcement of Title VII as a vehicle for promoting merit-based decisions in American employment. Whether that goal is advanced or retarded by supplementing private lawsuits with an administrative agency like EEOC is of course a separate question. However that question may be answered, it is apparent that the Agency as currently structured can function effectively only when it enjoys the political support of the incumbent President, butressed by the Congressional will to fund it at a level adequate to its tasks. This brief glimpse into some of the inner workings of EEOC is only a small piece of evidence that the Agency can use.


New Coordinator Of Student Information
Constance Newman, Welcomed

Please join me in welcoming Constance Newman to the Law School. She will be the Coordinator of Student Information in the Registrar's office as of Monday, March 26.

Connie attended Fordham and received her B.A. Summa Cum Laude, as well as an M.A. in Political Science. For the last two years she has been employed by the Rose Hill campus as a Senior Grants Writer making extensive use of a database system. We look forward to her joining the Law School administration.

Practice

Continued from page 5

1. Be undercapitalized. You'll need your savings to live off of for at least the first year.
2. Be undercapitalized. You'll need your savings to live off of for at least the first year.
3. Be undercapitalized. You'll need your savings to live off of for at least the first year.
4. Be undercapitalized. You'll need your savings to live off of for at least the first year.
5. Be confident before you attempt such a career choice and then be happy with your decision.
THE NEW YORK BAR EXAM
HAS CHANGED
AND BAR/BRI HAS CHANGED
WITH IT!!

There has just been a major change in the New York Bar Exam and it will benefit BAR/BRI enrollees.

The New York State Bar Examiners have dropped a number of topics from the Bar Exam, effective immediately. In addition, the Examiners will change the emphasis slightly among the remaining topics.

What this means to you is that you will be able to devote more time to the Multistate subjects and more time to the skills needed to optimize your scores.

We at BAR/BRI have already changed our testing materials to reflect the new Bar Examination. No longer will you be tested on such topics as Bankruptcy, Labor Law, Insurance, Municipal Corporations and other topics deemed unimportant for exam purposes by the Bar Examiners. There will be a renewed emphasis on the six core Multistate topics and on New York Practice, Wills, Trust, Corporations, Domestic Relations and various other topics that New York considers to be important.

Already, the free Essay Workshop that will be provided to every BAR/BRI enrollee for the summer of 1990 has been redesigned to reflect the new emphasis on the New York Exam. Plus, the free Multistate Workshop will be more valuable than ever.

The New York State Bar Exam keeps changing and BAR/BRI keeps changing with it. This change is primarily to take things off the New York State Bar Exam. In future years we expect the Bar Examiners will be adding things to the Exam, probably in lieu of the New York multiple-choice component.

Our staff of attorneys is now developing both a performance program and an enlarged essay program in the event that New York State goes in that direction. As soon as further changes occur, we will keep you informed.

BAR/BRI
BAR REVIEW