Over $30,000 raised at FSSF Auction
Astonishing Turnout Fosters a Spirit of Community and Generosity

by William Bruno

The much-heralded FSSF auction garnered over $30,000 from an enthusiastic standing-room only crowd in the McNally Amphitheatre the night of Tuesday, March 2. The purpose of the action was to raise money to financially support students who want to engage in public-interest work over the summer. As these jobs traditionally give limited remuneration, the receipt of an FSSF award can allow a student to engage in such work who otherwise couldn’t afford to. Last year, such monies were allotted to students who worked at organizations such as the Legal Aid Society, Covenant House, Bronx Legal Services and Prisoner’s Legal Services.

The effort was spearheaded by Judybeth Tropp, 92, one of the three directors of the Fordham Student Sponsored Fellowship. Ms. Tropp indicated that she had expected only 200 to show up and the count exceeded 500. Indeed, this resulted in the only glitch in the evening which was the premature depletion of the available liquor stocks in the pre-auction reception in the Atrium. The lead auctioneer was Ms. Benita Castro, President and C.E.O. of Castro Convertibles. Ms. Castro is the mother of Terri Austin, 92, who, in addition to her duties as SRA President, can also occasionally be seen in television and newspaper ads for this product. Ms. Castro was assisted by an intensely enthusiastic crowd who, when a bidding contest would break out, would root for each of the parties to up the ante and would applaud every time a sale was made. The goods and services offered ranged from dinner with professors to nights on the town with individuals students to the use of vacation homes. A few of the highlights follow:

- A package consisting of the unusual combination of one loaf of Irish Soda Bread and an Australian boomerang donated by Jennie Mone, 93, was bidding near the $100 mark when one Thomas J. Kavaler, LAW 72, offered a $500 bid for the package. This spontaneous generosity drew a standing ovation from the crowd.
- There was only one occasion in which Ms. Castro came close to losing her rhythm and that was when her daughter put in a bid for an item consisting of "five bedtime tracks, including bedtime stories and milk and cookies" which was donated by Sam Kirschner, 93. After remarking, "This is the first time I’m hearing of this!" she quickly, and successfully, solicited bids from other members of the audience.
- The auction fulfilled the ambition of at least one other individual. During the reception in the atrium, Gordon Kerper, 92, who offered a night on the town with him as one of the items, stated "I’ve been up for sale since day one. I just didn’t advertise it!"

Speaking of advertising, when the night on the town with Scott Fitzgerald, 92, was on the block, Mr. Fitzgerald had a flyer circulated entitled "A DREAM DATE WITH SCOTT FITZGERALD." The flyer, showing Mr. Fitzgerald’s face and...someone’s...well-muscled physique, described his turn-ons as "Immigration law, Seventeen magazine, sheep and bowling." A caveat to the purchaser, this reporter had occasion last year to go out drinking with Mr. Fitzgerald and a mutual classmate, the hangover lasted well into the following afternoon. Also, in the F.Y.I. department, the flyer listed some package deals, one of them being that marriage was an option available to the purchaser for a closing bid of "at least $100.00." Since you got Fitz for $250, we at The Advocate felt we should inform you of your options in the name of a full and comprehensive reporting of news that is the hallmark and responsibility of a free press.

There was a brief musical interlude when Guy Cohen, 93, who was selling guitar lessons and comprehensive reporting of news that is the hallmark and responsibility of a free press.

Mandatory Pro-bono Debated at Fordham
Faculty Suspends Consideration for Another Year

By Mike Fries

A student/faculty/administration town meeting on mandatory pro-bono at Fordham was held on February 13, 1992 and was moderated by Professor Flaherty. The meeting was well-attended. It was organized in a symposium format with a panel of five: One to argue each side of the issue and three others discussing the pro-bono programs, two of them mandatory, they ran. The goal of the meeting was an open discussion of the idea of mandatory pro-bono.

Alan Slobodin, President and General Counsel at the Legal Studies Division of the Washington Legal Foundation argued against a mandatory program. He argued that mandatory or forced pro-bono is an unnecessarily extreme and possibly unconstitutional approach. Mandatory pro-bono is objectionable because it is coercive. With "choice," mandatory pro-bono is inherently anti-choice, for it uniquely targets for forced pro-bono participation those...
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Judicial Commission Director Discusses Treatment of Minorities in State Legal System

By William Bruno

Over the summer, the New York State Judicial Commission on Minorities did a study on the treatment of minorities in the New York court system and found pervasive discrimination. Edna Wells-Handy, the Executive Director of that commission and now the general counsel to the city's Health and Hospitals Corporation, spoke at Fordham on February 21.

Ms. Handy described the study as covering not only blatant discrimination but the more subtle kind she described as “Northern racism.” The study did in fact find examples of the former, for instance at a courthouse in the Bronx that had segregated locker rooms, however, the study’s emphasis was on the latter.

According to Ms. Handy, some of the manifestations of the latter were in the differing treatment of people of color. Incidents (see page 7 for a highlights of the report) included white lawyers getting past security without being stopped while minority attorneys were stopped; whites getting more courtesy and getting advance sooner on the court calendar. She also stated that the facilities most used by the people of color were the worst (i.e., housing court, criminal court and family court) and mentioned that the report had a photo-essay illustrating this.

Ms. Handy also stated that the report indicated that there was a sliding scale of treatment based on skin color, with blacks and Latinos near the bottom. Asians were near the top and “almost identical with respect to Caucasians.” This sort of discrimination, Ms. Handy believes, constitutes an “attack on the dignity” of people of color from the moment they entered the system. She asserted that solving this was particularly important given that the judiciary relies strongly on public confidence to function.

On the topic of remedial measures, Ms. Handy argued that the entire legal system needed to be addressed. The courts did, after conducting their own study, adopt what she termed a “diversity program” to integrate positions in the court system. She also argued that Chief Judge Wachter, in his capacity as supervisor of the state’s legal system, could address the low number of people of color who graduate from law school, pointing out that a shortage of minority law students leads to a shortage of minority lawyers and judges.

Ms. Handy summed up the idea of the report by pointing out that fixing the imbalance among lawyers and judges was the easy part, that the hard part would be in addressing the prejudice felt by the user of the system because that would require altering behavior patterns and stereotypes. The executive summary of the report will be printed in full in the next issue of the Urban Law Journal. A copy of the complete report will soon be in general circulation in the library. An edition of the report is also scheduled to be printed by the Amsterdam News Foundation.

The discussion then took an unexpected turn. Ms. Handy had taken advantage of the sparse attendance (about twenty people) to bring the audience into close proximity and lessen the formalism of the event. In an exercise in personalizing the report, she solicited statements from the predominantly black audience as to their experiences in law school.

One student mentioned the efforts made at Fordham. She continued on page 12

Fordham and the Trial Competition

The Beginning of a Dynasty

By the 1992 Team:
Grant Esposito, Reed Harvey, Peter Monahan and Melissa Werdiger

When the list of team members was posted, everyone seemed to have two reactions: “Congratulations!” and “How did you get involved with that?” In order to better inform the students about this unforgettable opportunity and to insure the quality of future teams, we have decided to answer that question.

First, some background: The National Trial Competition was started by the Texas Young Lawyers Association (TYLA) in 1974. The competition is supported by both the American College of Trial Lawyers Association and the American Bar Association. The TYLA develops the problems which test the trial advocacy skills of law schools around the country. The opening rounds of the competition are held in one of eleven regions, the top two finishers in each region move on to the finals which are held in Texas.

Fordham’s team is selected from third-year students who take Trial Advocacy during the fall semester. Interested second- and third-year students are encouraged to take the course. The Moot Court Board assigns an editor to the competition. This year’s editor was Andrew Crabtree, who worked with Professors Bruce Green and James Kainen to select the team. Team members were chosen based on their performance in school, particularly their grades in Evidence, an interview and a test cross-examination. The 1992 problem involved a law student suing her school for injuries she claimed were inflicted by her teams faculty trial advisor while competition away from school.

This was the first year in which Fordham entered two teams in the competition. Each team consisted of two members with each advocate preparing both plaintiff’s and defendant’s cases. As the result of our efforts, the students practiced head-to-head and each team received the benefit of experiencing the other side’s perspective. In previous years, a three-person team allocated two members to oppose each other while a third “swung” between the two to complete a two-person team. Most other schools at the competition used this set-up, while entering two teams. This allows each advocate to concentrate exclusively on one part of the case. We leave to future teams to decide whether three-member teams which may be more polished are preferable to two-member teams which receive a fuller, more enriching experience.

To paraphrase Cher, “if trial advocacy skills came in a bottle, everyone would be on Fordham’s team.” We worked very hard. During winter break, we were crammed into judge’s chambers starting on January 3. From that point until the opening rounds were concluded on February 6, we did little else besides prepare for the competition, spending an average of five hours per day during the break and three hours per night during the semester. As the competition grew near, weekends were sacrificed either to videotape practice rounds or to shores up theories of the case. Those who either want to litigate or lose weight should consider trying out next year.

Fordham’s approach to the National Trial Competition is different than that of many other law schools. Our program focuses on developing the skills of an advocate rather than on winning the actual competition. During the competition we saw other schools who were scripted to perform on the facts given but seemed woefully unprepared to adapt to a more realistic scenario. Fordham’s approach was to provide a variety of experienced trial attorneys to critique the team on a daily basis, rather than to spend all the time working with one coach. At first, being exposed to a two-person competition...
Finding Employment – Summer 1992 and Beyond

By Kathleen Brady

The recession has forced law students to pursue employment with greater intensity. By taking a more aggressive stance, students are more likely to land the right job. A job hunt need not be a devastating experience; it does not require “guts” so much as requires thought, stamina and creativity. You must be prepared to use all the resources available to you to achieve success.

Lawyers, like most of the general population, typically make their career choices by default. They simply “fall into” something. Law is a field within which there is a vast array of careers requiring a vast array of talents. The skills needed to succeed as a prosecutor are quite different from those needed to succeed as a tax attorney. Today’s law student needs to turn his/her analytical and legal research skills toward the job search process.

The best tools that you can take into the job market are a positive attitude about yourself and a knowledge of your strengths. The way you understand yourself will determine your success. What you deem possible influences your hopes, aspirations, actions and the outcome of your plans. Take a long, hard, honest look at who you are and what you might enjoy doing. Forget about what you think you “should” do. Forget—for a moment anyway—about who is hiring.

List three to five of the most satisfying accomplishments or achievements. Draw from various times in your life: your youth, your educational/work/leisure experiences. Focus on the steps you took and the skills you utilized to achieve each of those successes. Analyzing what you have done before will help you to set a direction for the future.

Chances are that you will find a common thread among your accomplishments that will provide you with insight about what you are good at and what you enjoy doing. Identifying your skills is only one method of self-assessment. It is also important to assess your lifestyle preferences. Think about how and where you want to live; think about how your profession fits in with the rest of your life; think about what you want your work environment to look like.

Once you have identified your interests, abilities and lifestyle preferences, you should shift your attention to the job market. Jobs are out there—they just need to be uncovered. Keep in mind that information and personal methods of filling vacancies are preferred by both employers and employees because these methods are more in-depth and accurate. Employers are much more likely to hire individuals they know and can rely upon or someone who is known by an individual they respect. Employers are not anxious to have to process hundreds of resumes and applications that flood in when an ad is placed in the job books.

Informal methods are also preferred because they reduce recruiting costs and hiring risks. Therefore, job seekers who rely solely on traditional search strategies, like on-campus interviews and scanning the job books, won’t find work easily. You must use all the resources available to you to be successful.

Survey is what is available in a job market in order to uncover what the market’s needs are. Meet with as many attorneys as possible. Acquire as much information as possible. You need to learn about different specialties, settings and types of practice. You can do this in a variety of ways. Throughout law school, get legal work experience in several different settings. Seek out mentors; ask attorneys for their advice and guidance. Join organizations to explore issues of interest to you and meet people who share your interests. Attend career programs sponsored by the Career Planning Center to meet practitioners. Read the trade papers; not which areas are thriving and which are not. The more information you have about the legal profession, the more contacts you make—the better able you will be to find the perfect match.

There is no denying that this is a difficult job market. However, as attorneys, this is just the first of many challenges you will face. The current “precedent” of how to find a job is being challenged. It is up to you, counselor, to find the solution.

Large law firm seeking summer sublet housing for incoming associates.

Please call: Stephanie Skodnik at (212) 504-6540 between 9:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m.
Judaism: Why Believe?

By Nava Listokin

On Thursday, February 6, 1992, Rabbi Portnoy came to Fordham. Lightning did not rip apart cloud-blackened skies, thunder did not shake the earth's foundations, and everyone climbed a mountain to receive a set of stone tablets. Instead, refreshed by two boxes of baked goods and sunshine, a hundred or so 10-13 1/2 students contended for the existence of G-d and a unique system of meaningful living, all without ever stepping foot out of Room 206. This modest miracle repeated itself barely two weeks later when many of these same students and others discussed the veracity of the Torah, the body of Jewish law and belief.

Similarly, a person may logically object to the existence of G-d and His teachings, the Torah. If, when the question is raised during the discussion, plurality of opinion awaits hearing from past participants. So, what is the Torah?

Rabbi Portnoy prefaced the discussion with the observation that humans base their behavior on probabilities, supplying the example that drivers fearlessly glide through an intersection when given a green light upon the assumption that, most of the time, those who have the red light will do so only if forced to recognize the existence of G-d and His will. Similarly, a person may logically base his belief on probabilities, Rabbi Portnoy posited, while conceding that the gap of uncertainty would then have to be bridged by a leap of faith.

Rabbi Portnoy then offered three proofs of the Torah's divine origin. Firstly, he pointed out that the portion of the Torah that discusses the two signs that differentiates kosher and non-kosher animals mentions that there are three animals, each of which have only one of the signs. He asked how any human being could have known that in his second proof. He turns to the section of the Torah that describes how it was given to the masses, approximately three million people, in the ten days, and in this fraction of the generation of Jews accepted Torah, including its assertion that so many people attended its revelation, suggests that the assertion is true. Otherwise, why would they accept the Torah in the first place? If the Torah contained such a blatantly false assertion, these early Jews would have naturally responded, "What three million people? We were not present at Mount Sinai. Even our grandparents never heard of that place."

To this Rabbi Kugel made the surprising suggestion of forgetting G-d for the moment. He then returned to his earlier point, emphasizing that when a person lives Torah, his intellect will be forced to recognize the existence of G-d and His teachings, the Torah.

Like any good discussion, the first Jewish Identity discussion left many more questions than answers. It appeared that Rabbi Kugel's experiential approach did not suit the intellectual inclinations of the participants. JLSA therefore invited Rabbi Portnoy to lead the second discussion on Thursday, February 20th, which used a logical tact to answer the questions raised during the first discussion.

When these programmers deleted even one letter from the Torah database or altered the order, the pattern fell apart. Likewise, such patterns failed to surface when the programmers ran databases of other books, such as the Koran and the New Testament.

As expected this discussion raised enthusiastic questions and comments from the participants. Poor Ignatius Loyola is probably turning over in his grave over the lively interest in Judaism taking root in this bastion of Jesuit faith, Fordham University. Despite his discomfort, JLSA plans on continuing its discussion groups on a bi-weekly basis, every other Thursday, from 4:30 to 6:00 in Room 206, with topics ranging from intermarriage to Zionism. In all discussions, plurality of opinion and plethora of questions are encouraged. JLSA invites various discussion leaders to campus, always keeping in mind the interest of discussion participants. To that end, JLSA eagerly awaits hearing from past and potential participants for criticism and suggestions. After all, where there are two Jews there are three opinions. Please put them all in the mailboxes of either Michael/Mark/Sean/Rader, or Nava Listokin. In addition, keep posted by monitoring the JLSA bulletin board in the basement across from the phones for news of the next discussion group.
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My Own Private Idaho

A Rush and a Push and the School is Ours!

By Michael V. Gracia

Fordham is considered my most people to be the fourth best law school, out of a total of fifteen, in New York State. Fordham is probably in the best location in a city which is home to eight law schools. It is hard to argue with Fordham’s high academic credentials and reputation; they are, after all, the reason why all we all chose to come here over some other schools. Yet, I don’t think that any of us could have foreseen the poor quality of life that we, the student body, has had to endure.

Fordham, arguably one of the best law schools in the country, ranks low when it comes to caring for its students. The most recent example of this was our last WANG. To put simply, it was a joke. Now, this is probably the least significant of Fordham’s shortcomings, yet it is the one that has forced me to comment on the big picture.

It is unclear where fault lies. Is it the Law School’s administration’s fault? Is the SBA not doing its job? Is the administration of Fordham University to blame? Whoever the culprit might be, we all know that something is wrong. Let me explain.

The student lounges are not what they should be. The television had been broken for a year! Couldn’t the SBA or the school have come up with a $300 sooner to repair it so that students could at least watch the news while in school. The football table is outdated and students use it for lack of anything better. The video games are antiquated. Pac-Man?

The service that Marriott provides is inferior. The SBA says that this is the best arrangement that we can get. If this is the case, then we are poor negotiators. The meals are more expensive than they should be. A better meal can be had for the same price at one of the nearby delis. The cafeteria should be more than just a convenience to us because it is within our school grounds, there should be some other benefit to it. Marriott gets the better end of the deal because they know that it is inconvenient to leave school grounds for meals, they have captive audiences. It’s a scam.

Grades are traditionally reported to students late. Is there any excuse for this except health problems or emergencies? Would a firm wait this long for an assignment from an associate? Does the job description read “...and grading exams when time permits”? The library needs to be severely renovated. Not only does it lack beauty in its design but it lacks reading space, privacy, the lighting is inadequate — and there is no bathroom! Who was the genius who thought of that? I am almost sure that it wasn’t a woman. Any woman in the library who wishes to use the ladies room must 1) leave the library, 2) hang a right, 3) walk past the registrar, past the atrium room 4) make a left at the financial aid office. Is that inconvenient?

We are supposed to be competing with NYU and Columbia, yet schools such as Albany and Hofstra have better facilities. Why must we, as law students, share a computer room with the rest of the University? Other law students don’t have this problem. Why not Fordham?

How long has Fordham been at Lincoln Center? Since 1963 and just now they are building a residence hall? 30 years! (The Lucerne dorm is a quality academic). The dorm is not being built just for law students. My point is that it is time for the University to do something for Fordham Law School, which has a better reputation that the undergraduate school.

Finally, the WANG. Who runs it? Apparently not us. The University? Marriott? The administration? There should not be anyone else present but students, faculty/administration and guests of Fordham Law School. There must be a way that we, as adult law students in New York City, can have a few drinks within our walls of our school without rules that apply to the undergraduates of Fordham University, without what appeared to be a captive audience, in the school, or the school have a social hour on Fridays after classes, in school grounds, where faculty and students can meet informally, have a drink and get to know one another. How currently appears to be a disregard for the well being of the student body. If this is the case, how can tuition continue to increase when we are not getting our money’s worth?

I want to reiterate that Fordham is a fine school, but it is our job to make it better and to point out, to whomever runs the school and appropriates funds to it, what problems do exist. If not us, who; if not now, when?
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Bal's Corner

New York State Justice System: a Two-Tier System - A Summary

By Lisa Hayes

This past summer, the New York State Judiciary Commission on Minorities, a 17-member panel, appointed in 1988 by Chief Judge Sol Wachtler, published its final 2,000-page report and concluded that there are two justice systems at work in the courts of New York. The chairman was James C. Goodale, a partner at Debevoise & Plimpton and a former member of the Executive Council on Legal Services, which Wells Handy, general counsel of the city's Health and Hospitals Corporation. The Commission was funded by monies from private donations and was composed of an impressive number of persons from the legal profession including Cyrus Vance.

The Commission has studies and reported what many have known for years, that minorities and the poor receive disparate treatment in the American legal system. The problems encountered by minorities are endemic to the judicial system in New York which results in a denial of civil rights. The following excerpts are observations and recommendations of the Commission.

Selected Observations:

- Many minorities often are represented, particularly in Housing Court where 83% of blacks and 81% of Latinos have no counsel.
- A recent study of the Association for the Bar of the City of New York found that 50% of 123 federal and state judges hearing criminal cases in New York City said misconduct by attorneys in the courtroom was a serious problem.
- In 1989, only 6.3% of the states, 1,129 judges were black, 1.7% Latino and 25% Asian-American. African-Americans comprise 16% of New York's population and Latinos about 12%.
- Most courtrooms have all-white personnel, furthering the perception by many minorities that "those in authority do not treat them with consideration."

Judges often dispense "assembly-line justice," pushing cases "in and out in three to four minutes," said Mr. Goodale.

- The Commission's survey of litigators found that 44% believe whites often receive lower bail than minorities. The New York State Department of Criminal Justice Services, studying defendants with similar backgrounds who were charged with similar misdemeanors, reported that whites tend to be sentenced to pay a fine, while African-Americans and Latinos are sentenced to jail.

Selected Recommendations:

- Each court should have an ombudsman to assist the public in finding their way through the system and describing the court's operations, in languages such as Spanish and Chinese.
- Public defenders, and attorneys with the Legal Aid Society attended special training programs in litigation skills to improve their representation of the poor.
- Sentencing statistics based on race should be maintained by the Office of Court Administration and judges should review their procedures.
- More minorities should be included on judicial nominating and screening panels.
- The Commission recommends the adoption of random selection of judges to preside over all criminal cases.
- Judges should review their bail and sentencing decisions to ensure that they are fair and not influenced by racial or ethnic stereotypes.

The preceding observations and recommendations are just a few of the statements from the Commission's report that substantiated the findings that the New York Judicial System was biased regarding dispensing justice to the poor and minorities. Many organizations have called on the Chief Judge to begin efforts to act on the Commission's recommendations.

Recognizing the need to address the issue of underrepresentation of minorities among state judges, Governor Cuomo created a special task force to determine whether the judicial selection process and the composition of election districts violates the federal Voting Rights Act.

We are proud to announce the formation of the Fordham Law School Chapter of Amnesty International.

Interested students please call Jackie Didier at (212) 721-8616 for further information.

Weiscracks . . by Ari Weisbrot

Lawyers - A Second Opinion

Recently, my sister, a medical school student, let me in on a trade secret. It seems, lawyers are a favorite target of medical students and their professors. The old joke apparently goes, that a certain pathologist couldn't perform an autopsy on a lawyer because there was too much bullshit in his system to clear away. Lawyers seem to take a PR beating everywhere one looks. The great legal mind of our Vice President even jumped on the bandwagon. Dan Quayle, J.D., (Joe Dumbfounded), wants to propose legislation that will eliminate frivolous lawsuits and cut down on "slander, libel, defamation, misrepresentation, and misjudication."
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Solve the Problem

by John Cody

Recently, in a first-year Criminal Law class, I made an argument in support of the felony-murder rule as an effective means to achieve the punishment of criminals. In fact, I said, a broader (this proposition is expressed most succinctly in such nuggets of folk wisdom as, "Don't do the crime if you can't do the time," or "If you play, you pay").

The sparks started to fly, during and after class. Fascist, this attitude was called. Extremist, far-gone, draconian, I was told. Racist. Impractical and far too expensive.

And finally, begrudgingly, well, I guess you have a right to your opinion.

I'm not a fascist, I'm probably more liberal regarding certain issues than most of my classmates. I think drugs should be legalized. I am for minority rights, gay rights, women's rights, women's, men's rights, animal rights, free speech, flag-burning, cow-tipping or anything else we have that kind of society again? lead to sanctions on the police who violate them, not to letting those who praise him.

Restraints on state police power, such as those on intrusive search and seizure, are completely reasonable. Abortion rights, pornography, anyone put, violations of these rules should lead to sanctions on the police who violate them, not to letting those who praise him.

We must come up with a non-profit educational format for the television of America legal proceedings _ trials, appeals, supervision of bar associations and law schools. Such a company would work together with court administrators to assure that court proceedings _ trials, appeals, hearings _ would be presented in a dignified manner conducive to educating rather than titillating.

How NOT to Televis e Trials

by Alan Dershowitz

For the past 20 years I have been advocating the televising of court-room proceedings for educational purposes. When I was a law student, many others who share my view, had in mind was a not-for-profit educational production company, under the supervision of educational law schools. Such a company would work together with court administrators to assure that court proceedings _ trials, appeals, hearings _ would be presented in a dignified manner conducive to educating rather than titillating.

Instead we have "Court TV," a company that Steven Brill, who had made a specialty of commercializing the law. His magazine, The American Lawyer, has succeeded, almost single-handedly, in turning the practice of law into a cash, bottom-line business. Before the "Broadcasting" of the law, as it has come to be called, lawyers claimed to be part of a learned profession. We did not always live up to that claim, but at least it was an aspiration. "The America Lawyer" change all of that.

Now law firms are ranked not pri marily by their professionalism, their ethics or even their litigation successes. That are ranked by their bottom-line profits.

This kind of crass commercialism is already in evidence form Court TV. In anticipation of the William Kennedy Smith trial, Court TV claim that they had "exclusive rights" to the trial. It used this misleading claim to solicit contributions. When it acknowledged that it was "struggling to get advertising."

Court TV claim of "exclusive rights" was misleading because the only "right Court TV had was to be the "pool camera" in the courtroom. Even that limited right has been used for commercial advantage. In its "raw feed agreement" with local television stations, Court TV demands a per-diem payment for "each day of Court TV's coverage of the trial" and requires that the station "will not protect this arrangement..."

Since Court TV is the sole pool camera, this offer that can't be easily refused. Court TV's goal is to monopolize the television transmission of trials at enormous profit to itself. It brags that it already has exclusive camera rights in more than 80 percent of televised trials, and Brill is trying parlay these rights into big bucks. As a recent story in the Boston Herald conclude: "Brill now says he has received inquiries from cable operators interested in picking up the service. That agreement, however, does not come without a price. The contract between Court TV and a cable operator runs for 10 years.

Brill's attempt to monopolize the televising of trials also carries with it significant dangers of censorship. Local stations _ even networks _ which use the Court TV transmission cannot decide for themselves whether to show the faces of disclose the names of the accusing witnesses in cases like Smith's. The contract in the Smith case required every station to block the face and withhold the name. In a television interview, Steven Brill said it was his decision to censor the name and face of the defendant. Whether this information should or shouldn't be disclosed is a hotly debated issue. But it seems abundantly clear that the decision should be made by the court or station for itself. The decision should not be dictated by Brill as a self-appointed censor for the entire nation. (To be sure, any local station that chose to send its own people to Palm Beach could have picked up the feed directly from the courthouse media center and sent it back home uncensored, but the economic realities make that impossible for most stations, and indeed none, to my knowledge, did it.)

Another great danger of the commercialization of Court TV is that law lawyers are prepared to criticize it publicly. Their reluctance comes from fear of repercussions. Brill has a reputation for punishing his critics in the pages of his magazine. He also has a reputation for rewarding those who praise him. I have experience both the stick and the carrot. Most recently, when I first criticized Court TV for its commercialism, I received two frantic phone calls and a letter inviting me to become one of the Court TV commentators. Since I regarded this invitation as an obvious attempt to "buy off" my criticism, I turned it down.

But now the issue is beyond mere criticisms by lawyers. Several lawsuits are currently before the courts challenging Court TV's commercial exploitation of litigants to sell advertising time. I wonder if Court TV will cover those cases.

The day after the verdict in the Smith case, Steven Brill called me to say that if continue to criticize Court TV, I will be undercutting my own efforts to bring television cameras into the courtrooms of America. I responded that Brill's warning had confirmed my worst fears, namely that his way of televising trials _ selecting "big fish are swimming straight through the gaps in the net. And those fish are armed. And they're coming after people."

Besides epithets, some reasoned arguments were made in opposition to my rule of complete accountability. I continued on page 11

TOP TEN REASONS TO GO TO "A LEGAL LINE."

10. Your a law student and have no social life anyway.

9. Answers to all your finals will be transmitted via secure code.

8. It is what all your friends will be talking about the next day.

7. It isn't on Fordham Night at Gecco's.

6. See Fitz without a shirt on.

5. You really don't want to attend classes.

4. It will be shorter than last year's 3 1/2 hour marathon...

3. We promise.

Free program with each ticket.

2. At six bucks it's cheaper than a movie.

1. Aw, come on, just go—it will be fun!

FORDHAM FOLLIES 1992
Wednesday & Thursday
March 11th and 12th
Pope Auditorium
8:00 p.m.
Tickets $6.00
On sale outside cafeteria

OUTSIDE VIEWS 9
students who would otherwise choose clinical or other school public-interest law programs. In addition, Mr. Slobozian asserted that any educational value to mandatory pro-bono work would be marginal at best and would not offset the burdens and costs of administering the program. Estimates range from $400,000 to over one million dollars per year to maintain the program. He also asserted that mandatory pro-bono imposes a moral code, robbing students of the opportunity to think for themselves and that was inconsistent with the educational mission.

Matthew Nicely argued in favor of mandatory pro-bono, claiming that pro-bono activity should not be confused with charity. Charity is the giving of which one has no duty to give. Lawyers have a state-mandated mission for themselves and that was built. The program defines pro-bono work as work in an open market. As a result, lawyers are ethically bound to help the poor gain access to the public justice system; to do otherwise would be to deny equal justice to all and would call into question the very democratic principles on which this nation is built.

Mr. Nicely also asserted that since courses like Torts are required, pro-bono should be as well. It is not forced voluntarism, it teaches the importance of fulfilling ethical responsibilities. He also pointed out that pro-bono is a very broad term and included in this definition work at: District Attorney's offices; Mayor's offices; homeless shelters; other non-legal work geared towards helping the poor. He finally argued that pro-bono is more educational than clinical programs and less costly to operate. The three other panelists were: Jill Chaifetz, Director of Pro Bono Students (PBS), a volunteer program currently active in all New York City law schools. PBS facilitates a student's desire to work at public interest organizations and places students in available positions. PBS defines pro-bono work as work in public interests groups, courts, government, non-profit organizations, private firms working on pro-bono cases and work for professors.

Jewish Law Students Proudly Presents:

The First Annual PURIM PARTY at FORDHAM

When: Thursday, March 12 (ok, a week early) 5:30-7:30 p.m. -- just before the Follies

Where: The Atrium

What: Drinks (free beer), Purim snacks (hamantashen) and general revelry

Dress: Costumes are invited!!

ALL ARE WELCOME  BRING YOUR FRIENDS
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Where: The Atrium

What: Drinks (free beer), Purim snacks (hamantashen) and general revelry

Dress: Costumes are invited!!
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Solve the Problem
Continued from page 9

It's racist. Why should a bank robber causing an inadvertent death face the ultimate penalty while the bank manager gets a slap on the wrist? (You're right, and if you can prove a chain of proximate causation in the case of the white-collar criminal "causing" a heart attack in one of her victims, go ahead and invoke the felony murder rule. Better yet, make the penalty for both white-collar felony theft and for bank robbery life in prison without parole).

What about rehabilitation? (What about it? Don't accept unthinkingly the corollary assumption that a rehabilitated criminal need be released from prison. Let the offender be ever so chastened by his time behind bars, a kinder and gentler abomination, but don't let him out. If he really has acquired a new-found concern for the welfare of the rest of society, then he'll readily understand the justice of this position).

This goes against deterrence. (This, I think, is the strongest argument against my position. If the penalty for both burglary and for murder is life in prison, what will deter the burglar when confronted from concluding; what the hell, I'm subject to life imprisonment anyway, might as well pull the trigger. I concede that this is a genuine concern, but I still feel that the more overwhelmingly positive incapacitating effect will far outweigh these incidents. Besides, what deters the armed drug dealer now, in her confrontations with police?)

But a poor social environment leads to crime, and it's unfair to penalize so adversely people who have been victims of their entire lives. (Ahhh. This, I think, goes to the crux of the matter: it's a chicken or egg proposition. If creating a health social environment would lead to less crime, then isn't it also true that a reduction in crime would lead to a more health social environment? Pity the law-abiding person in the crime-ridden ghetto, struggling to support her family and the shield her hood from the horrors outside (or inside). What better way to nurture these positive impulses than to quash the destructive ones?)

We have come full circle. The ready acceptance of crimes violent to persons or property (as if these two can ever really be disentwined) is not normal. Violent crime is gross, intrusive, extreme. The solution must be correspondingly so. If we ever decide to come grips with the problem and are willing to fight fire with necessary fire, then maybe someday our kids will walk freely and our women will be able to jog wherever the hell they please. There's no excuse for not straightening out the criminal justice mess in our lifetimes. Our country has got a real problem — let's just solve it. On ice, ice, baby.

John Cody is a first-year student at the SUNY-Buffalo School of Law.

Trial Advocacy
Continued from page 1

many different practitioners was confusing because each style seemed persuasive and every stylist was convinced that his or her approach was the best. We quickly learned that most litigators do not suffer from low self-esteem or a lack of confidence. However, as we progressed we learned the most valuable lesson: everyone has their own style and a natural flow is the most persuasive. Once we developed our individual styles, we were able to pick apart those qualities and tactics that the visiting judges exhibited and incorporate them into our repertoire. The team would like to thank all the visiting judges for their help.

Our coaches, Professors Green and Kaimen, assisted us primarily in developing the most crucial aspect of trial preparation: the theory of the case. It cannot be overemphasized that a coherent theory of the case, however simple, which is supported by the facts is the key to success as a litigator. In fact, as practice rounds progressed, the theory of each side would develop further, what once seemed airtight became implausible; what seemed ridiculous became persuasive. The candid, and often blunt, give and take among the team members and coaches was one of the highlights of participation in this competition. Additionally, both coaches have had extensive trial experience and their insights into evidentiary issues were invaluable.

Our guiding light throughout the process was our editor, Andrew Crabtree. Andrew's organization in scheduling judges to evaluate us, in providing witnesses to practice on and in dealing with an often unsympathetic registrar's office to get rooms to practice in was remarkable. Andrew also faithfully assisted us as friend and coach. As he was the only "objective" person who saw us practice every night, he played a pivotal role in monitoring our progress. He also organized a fun-filled post-competition bash. Andrew has set a standard for future editors.

In the end, Fordham placed ninth out of twenty-five teams and was narrowly edged out of the eight quarterfinal slots. The Fordham teams defeated Yale and knocked-out Syracuse, the winner for the prior two years. It is reaching the Wales advancing schools offered credits to participating members. Future teams will also have to contend with a newly instituted "seeded draw" designed to benefit the历史悠久 dominant schools.

Finally, the team is eternally grateful to the student witnesses who selflessly volunteered their time to help us prepare for the competition. Specifically, Caroline Chu, Raymond Liddy and Helen Rho are to commended not only for all the nights they were prepared for us even though we were not prepared for them, but also for their real approach to the problem. Each of them treated the competition as seriously as the team members, and Fordham's teams were better because of it. For the second-years reading this: Save your evidence notes, take Trial Advocacy in the fall, try out for the team and finish the take we helped along!

Rangers
Continued from page 15

too much. The Rangers have this tradition of sparkling early and then fizzing late. The only years they have reached the semi-finals in the recent past was in 1986, and the last time they reached the Stanley Cup finals was in 1979. The more recent trend has been to bow out of the first or second round with a whimper. 1986 was a memorable year, as the Rangers make it out of the Wales Conference final, only to have their tusses skated out of the Montreal Forum by the Canadiens. But the Patrick Division finals was memorable, too. The Rangers were 2-1 behind Beezer's stellar goaltending, to take the series 4-2. The image of Beezer raising his arms into the air as time expired was memorable. The Garden crowd stayed and cheered wildly for at least 15 minutes. You were never in a louder building.

This adds up to a Knicks-Nets first round playoff series. Pretty exciting, eh?

Q: How do you know when a lawyer is lying?
A: His/her lips are moving.
The Class of 1992 cordially invites the Fordham Law School community and guests to the annual BARRISTER'S BALL to be held at Tavern on the Green April 11, 1992 at 7:30 pm

open bar hors d'oeuvres
sits down dinner dancing
* tickets on sale - March 4, 1992
* black tie preferred

Sponsored also by BarBri Bar Review

Judicial Commission
Continued from page 3

continued discussed the establishment of an optional tutorial program at Fordham and the effort to get the Admissions Committee to take a minority member. She also discussed the efforts to get more people of color on the faculty, moving to get minority applicants to submit resumes and then to get attention paid to those applications here at school. Another third-year said she had had mixed experiences but that it was easier to focus once she knew what she wanted out of the law school experience. She also argued that more focus was needed on minority affairs at Fordham, that people of color shouldn't just settle for one or two people on Law Review but had to address the concerns of the collective minority community. She pointed out, by way of example, that the day division of the Class of 1992 had no black males and expressed incredulity at the idea that the school couldn't find one qualified black male.

Ms. Handy closed out the discussion by stating that it was important for minority law students and lawyers not to allow themselves to be defined by others and to remember what they bring. Citing herself as an example, she related how she had once been involved in an issue involving an unusually large number of asthma cases at a particular hospital. She was the only person of color in a group of lawyers which she described as having had grandfathers who studied law at Yale and Harvard. She, however had grown up in that neighborhood and knew of a nearby factory that manufactured drugs and remembered the odor it emanated and knew to suggest an environment study of that neighborhood.

Those students who are interested in participating in an exchange program with Cuban law students please contact:

Maritza Bolano
President, Latin-American Law Students Association (LALSA)
(212) 636-6950
or
Leave your name, year & telephone at the International Law Journal Office
Professor Marjorie Martin Produces
Second Annual Art Show
By Diana Thompson

What offers paintings, drawings, collages, photographs, sculpture, sheet music, and poetry, remains open from 7am until 7pm, and is free? The Fordham Law School Art Show! In early April, Professor Marjorie Martin will once again transform stack level six of the library into an eclectic art gallery. The show will end on graduation day. She invites all artistic law students to participate.

Prof. Martin asserts that law students should know that some of their colleagues are artistic. She maintains that students and staff members should receive pleasure from their surroundings, "there's a lot of creativity here; we should show it off," stresses Martin.

Last year's participants included students, alumni, professors, and staff members. This year's artists include members of the same legal community, as well as Edmund ("Eddie") DiDona, a playwright who works in the Faculty's Secretary Office. Also participating are a student from Fordham's Graduate Business School, and possibly the daughter of one of the law school's professors.

Professor Martin will not participate as an artist. She professes to have no artistic talents. She believes, however, that each person is creative in some way. Prof. Martin's creativity shows in her ability to organize worthwhile events. Not only is she responsible for the school's art show, she was instrumental in arranging for Professor Anita Hill to speak at the annual dinner of the New York City Women's Bar Association. This event will occur at Tavern on the Green on May 20.

Throughout her life, Prof. Martin has enjoyed diverse art experiences in a variety of settings. Because her father was an Army officer, her family moved often. She lived with her parents and younger sister in Colorado, Kentucky, Missouri, North Carolina, Texas, Germany, and Japan, before finally settling in New York. Japan had the greatest effect on her. She enjoyed the writing, language, manners, and the dynamics of interpersonal relationships of Japanese society.

Prof. Martin is not a critic, although at least once a week she attends an opera, play, ballet, or concert. She enjoys everything she sees. She is excited just by the presentation of artistic expressions, especially if it is live.

Prof. Martin wants students to know that there is more to law school than books, "Don't leave your self behind when you walk through the doors" she says. If you have works of art to lend, please call Prof. Martin at 636-6827 before the spring break. Whether you are an architect, textile designer, or weaver, your creative masterpiece will receive the finest professional treatment.

March 1992 • The Advocate

ARTS & ENTERTAINMENT

Women's History Celebration
3/14, 3/21, 3/28
"Boxing for Beauty and Defense" Gleason's Gym 75 Front Street, Brooklyn (718) 797-2872 10am - 2pm $25

3/17
"Blind Justice - The Supreme Court: What Does It Mean For Women?" Four speakers will discuss: right to privacy, freedom of speech, women & constitutional law, the empowerment of women to ensure justice.

16 Midwood Jewish Center 1625 Ocean Avenue (Avenue K), Brooklyn (718) 374-8104 9:30am - 3:00pm $15.50 (includes lunch)

3/17
"Celebrating Puerto Rican Women Achievers" Book party and photo exhibit.

John Jay College 445 West 59th Street (718) 779-2504 9pm - 7pm FREE

3/26
"A View from the Bench" Hon. Betty Weinberg Ellerlin, N.Y. Supreme Court Hon. Cecilia Goetz, U.S. Bankruptcy Court Hon. Karla Moskowitz, Civil Court of N.Y.C. Hon. Felice Shea, N.Y. Supreme Court will be interviewed at The Women's City Club of New York 35 East 21st Street 353-8070 5:30pm - 7:00pm $5 (Read the Women's History Month Calendar and attend The Advocate's bulletin board for more events.)

Music
3/18
"Music for Harp" Julliard School Concert Alice Tully Hall 1941 Broadway (65th St.) No tickets required. 1pm FREE

3/22
"Music from Japan" Artists and musicologists will discuss traditional Japanese music, jazz, and contemporary music. The Asia Society 725 Park Avenue, 288-6400 $5 for students who arrive at 6pm.

Exhibitions
Now - 3/22...
"... And Then Columbus" This exhibition examines the pre-Columbian contributions of Africans and Native Americans to the Western Hemisphere, and destroys the myth of Columbus as "discoverer" of America.

Surrogates Court Building Lobby 31 Chambers Street Mon. - Fri., 9am - 5pm (Sponsored by The Caribbean Cultural Center, 307-7420.) FREE

4/7
Gerrick Obolston, Pianist Owly N.Y. Recital Carnegie Hall 8pm. $8 - $25 $5 for students who arrive at 6pm.

4/14
City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra Carnegie Hall at 8pm. Pre-Concert Lecture on Ravel's Daphnis et Chloé by Lawrence Kramer, Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Fordham University 6:45pm - 7:15pm. $12 - $45 $5 for students who arrive at 6pm.

5/2
Ella Fitzgerald Radio City Music Hall 8pm. $30, $40, $50

Other Activities
3/13 - 3/15 & 3/20 - 3/22 Spring Crafts Market American hand-made products of leather, wood, blown glass, etc. Jewelry, apparel, ceramics, and other items. Columbia University Ferris Booth Hall 115th Str. & Broadway 866-2239 Fri., 2pm - 6pm. Sat. & Sun., 11am - 6pm. $5

3/14 - 3/22
"Discovery '92: 500 Years of Flower & Garden Exploration" The New York Flower Show 15,000 square yards of natural beauty produced by regional and international exhibitors. Three lectures each day. View and purchase many varieties of plants. Pier 92 & The Hudson River West 51st Str. - West 55th Str. 757-0915 $8 weekdays, 10am - 8pm $10 weekends, 10am - 6pm Call for discounts for groups of five or more adults.

4/3
Mitsuko Shirai, Mezzo-soprano Hartmut Holl, pianist Carnegie Hall 8pm. $18, $5 for students who arrive at 6pm.
Book Review: Compelling Evidence

Compelling Evidence
By Steve Martini
G.P. Putnam’s & Sons, 379 pgs., $21.95

By Stuart Kohn

Compelling Evidence, by Steve Martini, is a wonderfully crafted courtroom thriller in the vein of Scott Turow's Presumed Innocent—it is a taut shocker that is absolutely impossible to put down. In fact, I suggest that you read this over spring break so your grades don't suffer, because this is the first book to come along that lives up to the standard set by Scott Turow. Compelling Evidence centers around attorney Paul Madriani. Once a successful corporate attorney on-the-rise, Madriani has fallen on hard times as the result of a self-destructive affair with the stunning and seductive Talia, wife of his former boss and mentor, Ben Potter. In a twist of fate, Potter, who is about to be nominated to the Supreme Court, is found brutally murdered. It first appears to be a messy suicide, but soon Talia is indicted for the murder of her husband. Facing the death penalty, Talia turns to her former lover, Madriani, to save her life. What follows is an intense courtroom drama and murder mystery. Martini adroitly explains the fine details of courtroom strategy. His characters are sharply drawn and appear true to life — if not original, as in Presumed Innocent there is an alienated wife, a faithful but cynical sidekick, and of course there is the manipulative mistress. In particular, Madriani is endowed with a dry, insightful, and penetrating sense of humor. Through Madriani, the reader learns how a murder case progresses both inside and outside of court — from the autopsy and the preliminary hearing to the final courtroom. Compelling Evidence offers an authoritative and uncompromising look at our legal system. You might even learn something that you missed in your Evidence class. Move over Scott Turow, Steve Martini is here.

Joe Malone, 3rd Year Day
"I refuse to commit myself to a statement."

Martine Thurin, 2nd Year Day
"Home studying and helping my brother prepare for his first major fashion show."

Sal Scannapieco, 2nd Year Day
"I’ll be pumping up whenever I can."

Mary O’Sullivan, 1st Year Evening
"Are you kidding?! I have to work. But just having vacation from school is a pleasure."

Edward Hosp, 1st Year Day
"Going to R.I. to work on the beard and the lumberjack song."

Melissa Verdiger, 3rd Year Day
"Going to Neda Nassiri and Chris Mervilla’s wedding in Philly and hopefully going to N.H. to ski."

L: Andy Smith 2nd Year Day "I’m going to spend the week making the world a better place to live."
R: Jon Shields 2nd Year Day "I’m going to St. Thomas or Kentucky depending on air fare."

The Roving Reporter Asks:

What Are You Doing Over Spring Break?
Patriot Games

By Chris Downey

If you were at the Fordham-Army game at the Rose Hill Gym on January 29 (which you weren't at because I would have met you there), you might have come away with this impression of the fledgling Patriot League:

Who is Fordham trying to kid, anyway? You have the respectable Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference for this motley crew of barely division one talent? The Patriot League commands so little respect that the NCAA made Fordham, last year's league winner with a 25-8 record, the MAAC is a great league.

The Patriot League that will enhance the national reputation of all its members.

The NCAA is all requiring all juniors to have completed two years of course-work toward their majors and all seniors to have completed three years toward their major to be eligible. That's going to deliver a devastating blow to the North Carolina States and Louisiana who graduate single digit percentages of their players. Fordham and the other Patriot League members already meet and exceed the NCAA requirements, allowing them to maintain stable rosters when the rules kick in.

The end result of the NCAA rules is that the quality of play in college basketball will probably go down overall, at least until the high schools respond by better preparing their student-athletes for college. This is going to be addition by subtraction for the likes of Fordham and the Patriot League.

There is another argument that says the new NCAA rules won't make any difference at basketball factories like UNLV because these schools will always have enough gut courses on hand to meet the requirements. (What was that University of Miami major they kept flashing during the ESPN Bowl? Kinesthetics? Kinesthetics?) But that latest NCAA edict isn't likely to be the last. Eventually, the rules will have some bite. That's when conferences like the Patriot League, whose members actually share a geographic region and an academic philosophy, will stick around while the many conferences formed for the sole purpose of getting their own slice of the television money pie will be long gone.

The Patriot League

- Army
- Bucknell
- Colgate
- Fordham
- Holy Cross
- Lafayette
- Lehigh
- Navy

League. Don't forget that any minor loss Fordham suffers in basketball competition it more than makes up for in football. Lafayette, Holy Cross and Bucknell have well-deserved reputations for excellence on the gridiron. While failing college basketball programs are easier to turn around than college football programs, Fordham has laid a strong foundation for the future.
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So You Think the Rangers Might Win the Stanley Cup?

By Rich DeAgazio

As most hockey fans know, the New York Rangers haven't won the Stanley Cup in 52 years. In sports lore, this is quite a long stretch to go without a championship, rivaling the droughts of the Chicago Cubs and Boston Red Sox.

To give you an indication just how long ago it was since the Broadway Blues got a chance to tote the Cup, Franklin D. Roosevelt was the President, and Adolf Hitler's generals were planning the blitzkrieg on neighboring France. The attack began in May 1940 and ended rather successfully (for the Nazis, that is) about six or seven weeks later.

1940 was also the last year the poor Rangers won the Stanley Cup. In case you're counting, that was four wars, 10 presidents, and 51 Stanley Cups ago.

All this talk of Lord Stanley, of course, is due to the Rangers' phenomenal success this year, which has led the fans and the media to tout the New Yorkers as the front runner in the race for the Cup. (Paraphrastically one might wonder, since the Rangers are the "front runner," whether Gennifer Flowers has slept with the team recently, and what effect this will have on their energy level).

Presidential politics aside, your optimism about the Rangers is justified, despite their tendency to peter out as the playoffs approach. Despite playing in the toughest division - the Patrick - the Rangers have the most wins (42) and the most points (88) of any team in the league. The reasons for their success this year are readily apparent.

First, the Rangers have the deepest goaltending tandem in the league in John Vanbiesbrouck and Mike Richter. This depth paid great dividends recently, with Beeler playing 12 consecutive games while Richter was injured, allowing the Rangers didn't skip a beat. If the Rangers trade either one of these guys, they're nuts.

Second, the Rangers have one of the best defensive corps in the NHL in Brian Leetch, who leads all defensemen in scoring with almost 80 points. Leetch is not only the best offensive defenseman in the league, but he is solid in his own end as well.

His partner, Jeff Beukeboom, said recently that Leetch never makes a mistake on defense. All of the great Stanley Cup winners have had great defensemen - Paul Coffey with the Oilers and Penguins, Al MacInnis with the Flames, Denis Potvin of the Islanders, and Bobby Orr with the Bruins all come to mind - and the Rangers have one in Leetch.

Third, the Rangers finally have some home-grown tough guys - such as Joey Kocur, Kris King, Adam Graves, and Jeff Beukeboom - who aren't afraid to throw the body. In the past, the Rangers were easily intimidated by bigger opponents like the Flyers and Canadians. This year the Rangers are intimidating the rest of the league. These bruisers have hockey skills (Graves has 20 goals, Beukeboom has a steady flow in front of the net playing in tandem with Leetch), and King has 10 goals playing on the checking line.

Fourth, the Rangers, who are fourth in the league in goals-scored, are the only team with a top player who can go all the way. Messier, of course, is a premier center who leads the team in points, and Leetch is an all-star. Winger Mike Gartner is on a 40+ goal pace, as usual. Finally, guys like Rockie of the Year candidate Tony Amonte (28), Sergei Nemchinov (27), Darrin Turotto (25) and Adam Graves (20) surround Messier, Leetch and Gartner with plenty of scoring touch.

But most important to the Rangers' success this year has been the leadership and skills of Messier. Messier is a born leader, plain and simple; he just will not stand to lose. (One even wonders whether the Oilers would have won all those Stanley Cups without him, Wayne Gretzky notwithstanding). As an indication of how much the players respect Messier, several Rangers nominated him as captain just days after the trade that brought Messier to New York and sent Bernie Nicholls, Steven Rice and Louie DeRosa to the Kings. There's no need to speculate who got the better of that deal. If playing 35 minutes per game doesn't kill him, Messier just may be the one to bring a Cup to Manhattan after all these years.

But knowing the Rangers as we do, we know not to get our hopes up...
SPRING SEMESTER DISCOUNTS

1992 AND 1993 GRADUATES
Registration fee of $75 = Discounted tuition of $1195

1994 GRADUATES
Registration fee of $75 = Discounted tuition of $1095

***DISCOUNT DEADLINE TO BE ANNOUNCED***

NOTE: Full tuition for the New York course is $1325

MULTISTATE PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY EXAM (MPRE)

EXAM DATE: Friday, March 13th
APPLICATION POSTMARK DEADLINE: Friday, February 14th
BAR/BRI MPRE LECTURE
NEW YORK CITY (LIVE PRESENTATION)
DATE: Sunday, March 1st
PLACE: Ramada Hotel at Madison Square Garden
TIME: 11AM to 3PM

OUTSIDE NEW YORK CITY (VIDEOTAPE PRESENTATION)
DATE, PLACE AND TIME TO BE ANNOUNCED
TUITION: Free for BAR/BRI enrollees.
($75 payment required - FULLY CREDITED towards your bar review tuition)

NEW YORK PRACTICE & PROCEDURE MINI-REVIEW

NEW YORK CITY (LIVE PRESENTATION)
DATE: Saturday, March 7th
PLACE: Ramada Hotel at Madison Square Garden
TIME: 10AM to 4PM

OUTSIDE NEW YORK CITY (VIDEOTAPE PRESENTATION)
DATE, PLACE AND TIME TO BE ANNOUNCED
TUITION: Free for BAR/BRI enrollees.
($75 payment required - FULLY CREDITED towards your bar review tuition)

For more information, stop by the BAR/BRI table at your law school or call the BAR/BRI office at (800)472-8899.