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FSSF AUCTION RAISES RECORD

$109,261 A New Law School Record

By Jeffrey Jackson ('96)

On March 14, 1996, The Fordham Student Sponsored Fellowship Auction raised a record $109,261, according to Paul Garfinkel, a third year student and Senior Director of the auction. Garfinkel, along with third years Jeanine Mitchell and Andrew Goldfrank, planned and organized the auction, which included over two hundred student volunteers and approximately 80% of the Fordham Law School faculty.

The auction has two components, a silent auction, where bidders bid on items displayed on various tables, and a live auction. The silent auction featured such items as "Legal Trivial Pursuit," a board game which sold for $35, and a book entitled "Supreme Court Practice" which sold for $40. Attendees included former Fordham Law Professor and now Federal Judge Denny Chin and many prominent Fordham Alumni. For the first time in the history of the auction, Fordham students were allowed to attend the silent auction free of charge between twelve and four P.M. Thirty items were reserved for student bidding, while others helped to facilitate the payment process at the end of the evening. Faculty members participated by bidding on items, as well as by presenting items for bidding. For example, Professors Fleming, Johnson, Thel & Fisch presented an Open Air Seminar on the legal implications of the O.J. Simpson trial in his new book In Contempt, reviewed by Jeffrey Jackson on page 10.

The first item, two tickets to a boxing doubleheader at Madison Square Garden, sold for $450. One bidder quipped, "I'll bid $450 if Professor Katsoris is on the boxing card." Other items included a dinner at a Chinese restaurant with Torts Professors Denno, Hollister, Magnetti, and Zipursky; Lunch with former Mayor Ed Koch, Doubles Tennis with Professors Treanor & Katsoris; and Billiards, Beer, & Bluebooking with Legal Writing Professors Ann Moynihan, Ted Neustadt, and Thane Rosenbaum.

Fordham Alumnus Thomas J. Kavaler served as a guest auctioneer and entertained the bidders with a sharp sense of humor, a mixture of Dennis Miller and the late Sam Kinnison. The shock-haired Kavaler auctioned a New York Mets Mimi-Season Package "donated by Mr James Zucker, class of 1997, he hopes," and auctioned Doubles Tennis with Professors Treanor and Katsoris.

Student volunteers served different roles in the auction. Some helped to display items up for bidding, while others helped to facilitate the payment process at the end of the evening. Faculty members participated by bidding on items, as well as by presenting items for bidding. For example, Professors Fleming, Johnson, Thel & Fisch presented an Open Air Seminar on the legal implications of the O.J. Simpson trial in his new book In Contempt, reviewed by Jeffrey Jackson on page 10.

Please see FSSF continued on page 4

![Guest auctioneer Tom Kavaler entertains the crowd with an outrageous sense of humor](image-url)
THE ADVOCATE
EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Jeffrey Jackson
MANAGING EDITOR
David Bowen
LAYOUT EDITOR
Haydce Correa
EXECUTIVE EDITOR
Kenneth P. Persing
ARTICLES EDITOR
Melba Felhity
COPY EDITORS
Yolanda Figueroa
Toni Jordan
POET LAUREATE
Earl A. Wilson
EDITOR EMERTUS
Catherine Manion

The Advocate is the official student newspaper of Fordham Law School. The goal of The Advocate is to report news concerning the Fordham Law school community and developments in the legal profession. The Advocate also serves as a forum for opinions and ideas of members of the law school community. The Advocate does not necessarily concur with opinions expressed herein, and is not responsible for opinions of individual authors or for factual errors in contributions received. Submissions should be made on disk in MS Word 5.0 or WP 5.1. We reserve the right to edit for length. Advertising rates available upon request. Contributions are tax deductible.

THE ADVOCATE
Fordham University School of Law
140 W. 62nd Street
New York, NY 10023
212/863-6964

To the Editor:

In the upcoming Student Bar Association election, the student body will have a wide range of candidates from which to choose. One ticket presents a wealth of experience and accomplishment to the student body; the ticket consisting of Ben Geyehrhan for President, Jason D’Angelo for Vice President, Robin Waugh for Evening School Vice President, Tara Stever for Treasurer, and Michael Blackshear for Secretary.

The individuals on this slate are both accomplished and respected. Ben is the present SBA secretary and a property class writing teaching assistant. Jason is a staff member of the Law Review and a Legal Writing teaching assistant. Robin is an evening student who holds a full-time job, and is a Stein Scholar. Both Tara and Michael are first year students and SBA representatives.

This team is interested in aggressively pursuing two goals: improving the administration’s responsiveness to the students and cultivating a sense of community among the students. If elected, this executive board would accomplish these goals by pursuing student suggestions, and by addressing a few specific student concerns.

First, this executive board will address student financial concerns in two specific areas. Students are often anxious about their financial aid packages. This board will work with the administration to assure that a sufficient number of spaces are available in required courses, such as Corporations or Evidence.

These goals are ambitious especially when coupled with the other tasks traditionally delegated to the Student Bar Association such as First Year Orientation, the boat cruise, allocation of the budget, intramural sports, graduation week, the Barrister’s Ball, and the Beer & Bagels softball tournament, but each of the members of this ticket is committed to fulfilling the board’s goals. Therefore, we, the members of this ticket, ask the students of Fordham Law for their votes and for the opportunity to serve them.

Ben Geyehrhan for President
Jason D’Angelo for Vice President
Tara Stever for Treasurer
Michael Blackshear for Secretary
Robin Waugh for Evening Vice-President

To the Editor:

My name is Allan Urgent. I am a second year day student running for the position of Student Bar Association President.

Why I Am Running For President?

Fordham was my first choice for law school. I like being here. Since I spend an enormous amount of time at school I deal with the inconveniences as much as anyone. I am willing to spend the time needed to confront the problems that we face here daily.

My Goals For the Coming Year

I would like to see an SBA that is more representative of student concerns. The SBA plays a big role in planning the law school social activities, but that should only be a part of what the SBA does. The following is a short explanation of things that I would like to see happen next year.

First, it is no secret that the quality of life for students in the law school cafeteria is horrendous. It’s dirty, dark, cold, and much of the furniture needs to be replaced. I am always wondering which chairs are holding up the tables before I sit down there. If we could make the cafeteria a place that people would actually want to spend time in, then we wouldn’t need to use the main stack level of the library as the student lounge.

Furthermore, I would like the SBA to lean on Marriott to provide a wider selection of food in the law school cafeteria. Forget about this upscale bakery business. Who’s buying that stuff anyway? I don’t remember anyone asking for ten different kinds of cake when I was a first year student.

Second, I would like to see an SBA Guide to the Fordham Law Faculty published. For the amount of money that students pay to attend Fordham, we should be able to make informed choices about who we take our courses with. There are a number of professors who are consistently called horrible teachers by students. I want this to be public information, not just part of the rumor mill. The professors sitting on the tenure committee don’t have to spend four months doing so, the SBA should make an effort to provide a reliable source for these people. You do.

Third, I would like to see an SBA President who is involved and supportive of the student groups at Fordham. The President should attend many student group meetings, and events. By doing so, the President can find out how the SBA can better serve students. I would also like to see the SBA’s “Speakers Forum” committee, which is mentioned in the SBA Constitution, assist in bringing intelligent and insightful people to address the law school community.

Fourth, I would like to see the SBA become more inclusive of all Fordham students. SBA should produce an Evening Division newsletter, and work to make more varied social activities available for students who either do not drink or are family oriented. Although I enjoy the nights out at the Upper West Side Bars, SBA should make an effort to offer other social outlets.

Why You Should Support My Candidacy?

The election for SBA President should not be merely a popularity contest but rather an effort to select a President of the Class of 1997. The SBA President is the student representative who deals with the needs of all Fordham Law Students. I intend to change the way we as students view the SBA. All law students are members of the SBA. You can check the S75 charge on your last bill to prove it. Therefore, the SBA should not be run like any other student group. All students have a right to know how their money is being spent, and should be continually updated on the SBA’s progress on issues of student concern (for example, did you know that the SBA President gets a $500 stipend? You should be sure that the person you vote for actually earns it).

The other candidates may try to characterize this election as a choice between experience. However, I suggest that you use caution if all the other candidates have to offer you is their “experience.” Experience in this context can easily lead to complacency.

Ask yourself, “What do I know about the way the current SBA is run?” What do I know about its goals? What gains have the present SBA achieved for us?”

I have worked in student organizations as an undergraduate and here at Fordham. I know that it often takes a lot of hard work to accomplish even the most modest goals. But I truly believe that reasonable goals can be obtained under tireless and dedicated leadership. I think that our SBA can do more.

I intend to be a visible SBA President. I intend to set goals at the beginning of the term and report to you regularly on the SBA’s progress in achieving those goals. I want you to be aware of when the SBA is meeting, which members of the faculty and administration the SBA spoke with, and how the SBA is improving the quality of life for students in the law school.

You deserve to have an SBA President who will provide active, and conscientious leadership. I believe that I can do this for you. Please vote for me for SBA President. Thank you.

Allan Urgent is running with Craig Ascher (second year day) for Vice-President; Sam Khich (second year evening) for Evening Division Vice-President; Nancy Conniff (second year day) for Treasurer; and Mark Sherman (first year day) for Secretary.
Putting the STUDENT back in STUDENT Government

Alyssa Mendelson for President
Andrew Feigin for Vice President
Roy Richter for Evening Vice President
Kenny Rios for Treasurer
Amairis Pena-Chavez for Secretary

On April 15th and 16th you will be asked to elect next year's Student Bar Association Executive Board. For many of you, this decision will be made with little actual information on what the Student Bar Association (SBA) does. Let us tell you a little more about SBA, and why we hope you vote for our slate of candidates.

Goal #1: An SBA Constitution ratified by the students

Our first goal will be to redraft the SBA constitution and submit it to the student body for ratification. The SBA is ultimately responsible for funding and overseeing student organizations as well as communicating student concerns to the administration. It is important that the SBA is guided in these endeavors by clearly defined purposes and procedures.

Goal #2: Continue to increase student involvement in the budget process

The SBA is funded with approximately $80,000 annually. In the past, Executive Boards have singlehandedly allocated all funds to student groups. This year all student groups participated in the budgeting process and the Student Budget was approved by a majority of student groups. This, however, is only the first step in opening up the budgeting process to all students. The next step is to establish a budget committee, open to all interested students, which would work with the SBA Treasurer to create uniform standards to ensure fairness to all organizations.

Goal #3: Student representation on all law school committees

Currently, most major decisions affecting the quality of our education are made by the faculty and administration with little student input. A primary focus of our board will be to create a place for students on all law school committees. This will enable students to help steer the process with little student input. A primary focus of our board will be to create a place for students on all law school committees.

Role of SBA in Student Organizations

Executive Boards have singlehandedly overseen student organizations as well as student standards committees as well as on the Board of Trustees. All interested students will be eligible for service in a committee.

Constitutional Rights to Bear Arms, which was to be followed by a round of skeet shooting in Bucks County, Pennsylvania. In response to the question "What's all of this worth?" the professors remarked, "Constitutional Rights are inalienable and can't be valued in the marketplace."

Garfinkel predicts that when the final count is made, the total amount of money raised will be over $11,000. This dollar amount breaks a record set last year, when the auction raised approximately $90,000. The FSSF auction raises more money than any American law school, according to Garfinkel. The money raised during the auction will be used to fund scholarships for Fordham students interested in public interest law work. The funding takes place on two levels, first year students are given $3000, second year students are given $4500. Students receiving these scholarships work forty hours per week for ten weeks during the summer in an area of public interest law.

When asked how much work was involved in planning and executing the auction, Garfinkel said that "it takes a lot of work." Personally, Garfinkel put in an average of eight hours per day for a seven month period, which began in September 1995. At times, volunteers work between sixteen and eighteen hours a day, seven days a week, and at other times the Public Interest Resource Center did not close for three or four days at a time. Volunteers put in "hundreds of hours" canvassing merchants and performing various other tasks. Even after the auction, volunteers did follow-up work to make sure that bills were paid. When asked why he volunteers for the auction, Garfinkel commented that "the fellowship has a truly profound impact on the New York legal community." Last summer, the Fellowship awarded 38 scholarships, enabling students to work a total of 16,000 hours. Garfinkel further commented, "The greatest impact that I can personally have in public interest work is directly serving someone else, other students. From a practical standpoint as a public interest-oriented student, the greatest impact that I can have is to serve other students."
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LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Advocate:

I was very saddened to read about the third year student cited for defacing property (The Advocate, March 21, 1996). What saddened me more was hearing about the disciplinary issues. What you have seemingly tried to accomplish is the polarized treatment of various groups within the law school through the use of inflammatory and hysterical tabloid style journalism, and this is very disappointing in light of who and where we are. I could understand your reaction (e.g. a full page spread on "the case of the malicious doodler") if perhaps swastikas or white supremacist slogans were drawn on the calendar. But really, magazine style headlines and jokes about legal writing? Get real! Can't we lighten up a bit? Can we just be happy to be in the 28th best law school in the country, and try to survive living in a microcosm of what we will be facing when we get out? Will everyone be so perfect when we are lawyers in the community? Will we be pouncing on everyone who looks at us with the wrong facial expression, or who tells the wrong jokes? Do we have to whisper to our most intimate friends, fearful of being sent for "sensitivity training" or thought re-programming? Society is getting scarier and scarier. And I thought that law school was scary enough. The Advocate does us all a disservice by yelling fire in a theater where there is indeed no fire.

Some students may be more or less considerate or sensitive, but let's face it, folks, we can't even get all students to flush the toilet when they finish going to the bathroom, or to be considerate and keep their mouths shut in the library when others are trying to study. So why try to denigrate a student who (I don't even know him) probably is committed to social issues and to racial equality. Why else would he be on the Urban Law Journal, because he is a racist?), and just let his ground down and doodled like lots of us do. Only he doodled on the wrong picture. Off with his head.

We have to chill out and get some perspective, or we will consume ourselves with resentment and perpetuate grave injustices upon others such as was done in the public demonization of this hapless doodler. He could have been any one of us, and it wasn't fair what you did to him. There is real racism and bias out there in the community. We should get real problems and attack them rather than be so quick to attack one of us. (Yes, we all get the same Fordham diploma, right?) for soothingly to dumb. I think that you owe the student body (as well as our doodler) an apology. By the way, I think apologies should be accepted. It's the right thing to do.

Anonymous III

---

continued from previous page

Goal #4: An Honor Code

Lately, grave concerns have emerged as to the academic integrity of our school. This past year has been marred by allegations of plagiarism in the first year legal writing program as well as improper conduct at exams. These incidents threaten the reputation of our school and the strength of our community spirit. We will work with students and the Administration to investigate possible solutions to this crisis, including the possibility of creating an Honor Code at the Law School.

Goal #5: Improving communication between all students at the Law School

Classes and clinics offer students many valuable educational opportunities at the Law School. However, it is the opportunity for friendships and long-standing professional ties at law school that is invaluable. The strength of our community directly affects the strength of the reputation of our law school. Thus, as leaders of our community we will always be seeking ways to improve communications between students and to foster better understanding between each other. We will work with individual students and student groups to create opportunities for students to discuss issues affecting the community. To make ourselves more available to students, we will have regular office hours (during both day and evening classes) and a SBA comment box. Additionally, we will establish a semester calendar, visible to all students, that will inform students of all upcoming activities.

We ask for your support this April and in the coming year as we strive to improve the quality of student life in our community.

Please Vote:

Alice Mendelson for President
Andrew Feigen for Vice-President
Roy Richter for Evening Vice-President
Kenny Rios for Treasurer
Amairis Pena-Chavez for Secretary

Remember folks, you do not have to vote for an entire ticket! You can vote for individual candidates from separate tickets. But the most important thing to remember is that you must VOTE!

WHY BAR/BRI

BECAUSE EXPERIENCE COUNTS

For more than 25 years, BAR/BRI has guided over 500,000 students through law school and the bar exam!

Let the POWER OF EXPERIENCE work for you
"How To Succeed In Law School Without Really Trying" - A Review

by Yolanda Figueroa ('98)

On Thursday, March 21, I attended the second and last performance of this year's Follies, entitled "How 2 Succeed in Law School...without really trying!" I sure hope Frank Loesser's attorney wasn't aware that Loesser's title had been used. In fact, I shudder to think of the copyright infringements which were perpetrated throughout. I only hope that there's some type of loophole for amateur performances by law students.

Speaking of amateur performances, I was pleasantly surprised by the talent within the show. Notwithstanding that the Follies' organizers confessed to not having the abilities to sing, dance or act, this was belied by many of the performances.

Particularly charismatic was Trey Sandusky, one of the directors of the show, as Professor Malloy. Speaking of amateur performances, I was pleasantly surprised by the talent within the show. Notwithstanding that the Follies' organizers confessed to not having the abilities to sing, dance or act, this was belied by many of the performances.

Particularly charismatic was Trey Sandusky, one of the directors of the show, as Professor Malloy. As someone who's never had any contact with this professor, I still found it very amusing and frighteningly familiar. However, this scene did go too long and lost some of the audience.

Also noteworthy, though, were the four leads playing Fordham law students whose storylines are followed from first year to graduation. John Butler (another director), as Arnold DeBenedictus, seemed to exult in playing a scheming, womanizing manipulator and John Carlton, as Thomas Lacker, had his own cheering section in the audience.

The two female leads, Eva Landeo (again, another director) as Penny Flatbroke and Jenna Smith as Jennifer Driven were very accomplished. Despite a hesitant beginning by Eva Landeo, she later stopped the show with her singing in The Writing Competition scene.

Some of the scenes with these four characters, however, while attempting to focus on their group dynamic and the changes they were undergoing at law school, seemed to slow down the rhythm and energy of the show, especially when placed between strong scenes like Malloy's Classroom and the Bar Review Sign Up. The show also contained several inside jokes regarding certain students which were not understood by some of the audience.

Who is Peggy Healy? And is she really that annoyingly saccharine?

Please see FOLLIES continued on page 11.

A Free Night Out
There's a concert at Carnegie Hall and second- and third-year students are invited.

It's in April, before exams and bar review courses cramp your social life. The award winning Carnegie Mellon University philharmonic will perform works of the Greek contemporary classical composer Iannis Xenakis to kick off a celebration of the maestro's 70th year.

The tickets would be $35 each if you had to pay for them, but second- and third-year students can get up to 2 free.

The program includes works for full orchestra, small percussion ensemble, and soloist. The Washington Post thinks the CMU Philharmonic is “decisive and clean playing.” Was your last meal of law that good?

So, fill out the coupon and invite a friend for a night at Carnegie Hall. And then get back to work.

We'll mail your tickets to you a few weeks before the April 23rd concert.

The curtain goes up at 8:00PM.

| Name ________________________ | Address ________________________ |
| Phone ________________________ | Grad yr _____ | # of tix 1 2 |

If you prefer, you can e-mail the above information to acg@panix.com or sign-up outside The Advocate office.

Mail to: Attorney Career Guidance 149 Fifth Avenue, Suite 709 New York, NY 10010

Tickets provided courtesy of Attorney Career Guidance, Inc., a New York City-based transition consulting firm for law students and attorneys.
ANSWER

POETRY

Beating the Odds or
The Thoughts of an Old Racehorse

"The end’s in sight."
Neighed the voice inside
This runner’s fevered brain.
"A few moments more"
Of this drug chore
And its pastures and mares I’ll gain!"

"Weary am I."
Was his equine thought
Tho’ he charged mightily on
Bearing rider and dream
An inseparable team
While gamblers looked eagerly on.

"Long odds on this race!"
He won’t even keep pace!"
The excited bookie had crowed
As he took bets left and right.
From every gutter in sight
On a stallion now grown old.

But Life and Hope
Are partners true.
And Age cares not a whit
For Fain and Courage supreme rule.
And many gamblers were sadly fooled
While this winning horse charged the bit.

"I hear them roar!" he thought again,
They don’t believe I’ll win.
But he’d run so many, many times
And there it was – the finish line!
The crowd lost money, suppressed a whine,
But the horse just shook his head and smiled.
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GIRL SIX
A FILM REVIEW
By Miles Marshall Lewis (’96)

Hollywood has a problem with women. Countless examples abound: Barbara Streisand being snubbed by the Academy Awards for a Best Director nomination for The Prince of Tides; the over-proliferation of girlfriend/dame-in-distress roles; and the fact that three of this year’s Best Actress Oscar nominees portrayed prostitutes or sex objects. So one might assume that Girl 6, the story of an aspiring African-American actress, will just add more grist to the sexist Hollywood mill. Not necessarily.

Girl 6 is the story of Judy (actress Theresa Randle), a struggling thespian who becomes a “telecommunications solicitor” when distributing flyers and cashiering at Club 6 begin to wear her down. The dual blows of a debasing audition for hot director-of-the-minute Q.T. (played astonishingly on-point by Quentin Tarantino) and a trying exchange with her demanding acting coach prompt Girl 6 to pursue this dubious trade.

After passing on more hardcore, pornographic employment, Girl 6 is hired by an agency that provides protection and a secure, almost unrealistically anti-septic, environment. Surrounded by Lil (Jennifer Lewis), a matronly boss, and co-workers like actresses Debi Mazar and Naomi Campbell (adored by director Spike Lee’s camera to the point of planting hopes of a Girl 75 sequel), all is well for a time.

The conflict in this script by playwright Suzan-Lori Parks is created by Judy’s descent into the phone-sex world. Walking into Lil’s office for her initial interview, guessing a seven-letter name, six letters, who falls down the elevator shaft of her apartment building (from the sixth floor), and the child’s progress throughout Girl 6.

Director Lee - who, despite his notoriety for media manipulation of racial politics, has skill approaching Martin Scorsese, Oliver Stone, or Woody Allen - pulls off old film school, Felliniesque experimentation in Girl 6.

Director Lee - who, despite his notoriety for media manipulation of racial politics, has skill approaching Martin Scorsese, Oliver Stone, or Woody Allen - pulls off old film school, Felliniesque experimentation in Girl 6.

pornographic employment, Girl 6 is hired by an agency that provides protection and a secure, almost unrealistically anti-septic, environment. Surrounded by Lil (Jennifer Lewis), a matronly boss, and co-workers like actresses Debi Mazar and Naomi Campbell (adored by director Spike Lee’s camera to the point of planting hopes of a Girl 75 sequel), all is well for a time.

The conflict in this script by playwright Suzan-Lori Parks is created by Judy’s descent into the phone-sex world. Walking into Lil’s office for her initial interview, guessing a seven-letter name, six letters, who falls down the elevator shaft of her apartment building (from the sixth floor), and the child’s progress throughout Girl 6.

Director Lee - who, despite his notoriety for media manipulation of racial politics, has skill approaching Martin Scorsese, Oliver Stone, or Woody Allen - pulls off old film school, Felliniesque experimentation in Girl 6. Judy’s slide is underscored by the subplot of 6-year-old Angela (beautiful name, six letters), who falls down the elevator shaft of her apartment building (from the sixth floor), and the child’s progress throughout Girl 6.

Director Lee - who, despite his notoriety for media manipulation of racial politics, has skill approaching Martin Scorsese, Oliver Stone, or Woody Allen - pulls off old film school, Felliniesque experimentation in Girl 6. Judy’s ex-husband, Shoplifter (portrayed by an excellent Isaiah Washington), caresses fruit at a Korean grocer in zoom-lens close-ups meant to conjure visual analogies to breast sizes. Girl 6 removes her top for Q.T., in grainy film stock that recalls sleazy, pornographic cinema. Judy and Shoplifter have a bittersweet recon-
Striving for Justice

O.J. Prosecutor Christopher Darden chronicles his journey to big-time L.A. law on the "wrong side" of Trial of the Century

by Jeffrey Jackson

IN CONTEMPT

By Christopher Darden
with Jess Walter.
387pp.

Chris Darden's autobiographical account/In Contempt confronts a reading audience whose members, both black and white, yearn for an "O.J. free" America. With the able assistance of Jess Walter, author of Every Knee Shall Bow, In Contempt is as straightforward and piercing as a fence's foil. In a reflective tone, Darden chronicles the events in his life, including the O.J. Simpson trial and, inter alia, Answers the nagging question posed to many present and future black prosecutors: "How can you possibly throw your black brothers and sisters in jail?"

Darden regarded the Black Panthers as his heroes because they "stood up for themselves" and said that if O.J. Simpson really "wanted to impress him, he would have opened a free clinic in the neighborhood or brought guns for the militants."

Darden shows that he understands the experiences that frustrate many young, talented Black Americans. For example, he recalls being placed in woodshop and metal shop classes, despite his brilliance would earn him a career as a lawyer, he says. This attitude exacerbated the fiercely competitive, isolationist atmosphere prevalent in many law schools; for example, Darden's law school classmate of Darden's, a classmate of Bill Green, a former L.A. County District Attorney, publicly accused Darden of being a "sellout," and condemned the reason that Darden was on the prosecution team was because he was black. Settio, in Darden's mind, "was the least offensive thing a black could be called by another black" and "was the equivalent of publicly being called a nigger by a white lawyer." He also recalls, "The fallout was immediate. On talk radio and in newspapers, my opinion, the book is a thorough examination of black people's suffering and the limitations put upon us by the American opinion."

Confidently, this message will most likely fall on deaf ears; many black people condemn so-called "sellout" behavior, and "Black prosecutor" is synonymous with "black conservative" or even worse, "Black Republican." (I foresee loud, angry responses in my future: "How dare you compare Chris Darden to Malcolm X!?"

Darden's constant reference to black history characterizes the main theme of his book - delayed justice. Growing up in the San Francisco Bay Area, Darden regarded the Black Panthers as his heroes because they "stood up for themselves" and said that if O.J. Simpson really "wanted to impress him, he would have opened a free clinic in the neighborhood or brought guns for the militants."
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The First Thing We Do Is Get Rid of All the Critics

by John Mastandrea ('96)

A federal judge throws out extensive evidence of drug trafficking. As a result, the prosecution of an admitted drug runner is jeopardized. A criminal court judge lowers bail for a man charged with domestic abuse. Once freed on bond, the defendant stalks and kills his former girlfriend.

The initial flap surrounding the decisions of judges Lorin Duckman and Harold Baer has subsided, for the most part. Angry masses are no longer burning judges in effigy in the public square. But jurists and lawyers remain buddled in their garrans and libraries, wondering aloud why the people would persecute them so. Even our esteemed dean has publicly rued what he calls the "challenge to the independence of the judiciary."

Instead of indulging in self-pity, it may be more useful for the organized bar to step back and examine just what has gone wrong in the common understanding. Clearly, the public's expectations regarding the judiciary have nothing to do with any constitution, statute, or code of judicial conduct. It's time to get back to basics.

For several generations, social reformers have developed new and resourceful ways to short-circuit the chummy formalities of the lawmaking process, often through creative use of the courtroom. Those efforts have not gone unrewarded. When it seemed fit to limit the powers of police and prosecutors, the courts entertained new approaches to short-circuit the process. But in a system of participatory democracy, such a scheme of short-term gain can only result in long-term misfortune. People have literally forgotten to defend the current regime. Most importantly, the judiciary must be adamant about its limited role: "We're judges. We apply the law; we do not guarantee outcomes. If you don't like the law being applied, go petition your legislator."

by Richard Wurmbrand

People gain can only result in long-term misfortune where the judiciary should belong in traditionally staged rallies in front of the court by segregation or long-distance telephone service, the courts have repeatedly demanded results that conform to opinion. Whether the issue was school desegregation or the right to die, the courts seemed to bring about the preferred outcome? Or the judge, who is supposed to be able to manipulate the law in order to bring about the preferred outcome? There is no satisfying answer to this unfortunate question.

This year the people (and their long-complacent elected representatives) have risen up to demand an accounting. Their anger betrays at least a hint of hypocrisy because they had acquiesced all along in the judiciary's colonization of neglected areas of policymaking. Legal professionals steadfastly downplay the legitimacy of the court's role, betraying a hypocrisy of their own. Lawyers should be very wary of assuming a "we know better" attitude, since they themselves had a hand in obfuscating the court's proper role. If lawyers really did "know better" they would have anticipated this accountability crisis.

New York's Chief Judge Judith Kaye has already come out in favor of the status quo, announcing her concern that the criticism aimed at the courts puts judges at the risk of being "tempted to reach results that conform to opinion polls and popular passions." Dean Feerick seems to agree. The bad news for them is that the judiciary already trades in the currency of popular passions.

The solution is not to silence the critics, but to immediately redefine the blurred lines between the courts, the legislature, and the people whose consent theoretically gives legitimacy to the entire system. The organized bar should refrain from reflexively closing ranks to attack judicial effort was not considered progress, but tragedy. Criminals were walking free. Women and children were being beaten to death. The "right outcome" wasn't being achieved. Who takes the blame? The law, which for years has been treated as a mere beast of burden? Or the judge, who is supposed to be able to manipulate the law in order to bring about the preferred outcome? There is no satisfying answer to this unfortunate question.
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LET'S SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT:  
AN OPEN LETTER TO THE NATION'S LAW STUDENTS

More than 25 years ago, I founded BAR/BRI Bar Review upon two core principles: first, law students deserve the best and most up-to-date bar review possible; second, they should expect their bar review course to maintain the highest ethical standards in informing students about the courses. Since that time everyone at BAR/BRI has held fast to those principles.

Unfortunately, the nation’s newest bar review, West Bar, has not.

In law schools across America, West Bar has blanketed bulletin boards and flooded student mailboxes with misleading flyers and letters. Students everywhere are being asked to believe that BAR/BRI has been stripped of its best and brightest.

I assure you that nothing could be farther from the truth. In over 25 years as the President and CEO of BAR/BRI, I have never responded directly to the claims and puffery of other bar review courses. However, in light of the sheer volume of misinformation, I feel compelled to separate fact from fiction.

FICTION: BAR/BRI’s management has left.  
FACT: Last year, two former BAR/BRI employees started West Bar. Contrary to West Bar’s claims, neither ever served as the President or National Director of our company. In fact, both were primarily regional directors with no meaningful input in the creation or editing of materials or lectures. It is true, however, that these two former employees aggressively pursued many of BAR/BRI’s attorneys. Their efforts fell flat. Of the more than 50 attorneys working for BAR/BRI nationwide, a grand total of one left.

FICTION: All of BAR/BRI’s best faculty “went West.”  
FACT: Here too, West Bar’s aggressive pursuit was in vain. BAR/BRI has over 300 lecturers in 46 jurisdictions. Only 10 left to join the two former BAR/BRI employees in their “start-up” bar review. Seven of these ten were ranked in the bottom 25% on BAR/BRI student evaluations.

Your bar exam is too important to be left to inexperience. I know that students have historically selected their bar review course based on experience and quality. I trust that BAR/BRI's more than 25 years of preparing students for bar exams nationwide counts as experience. And I am sure that over 500,000 successful attorneys can vouch for our quality.

We look forward to helping you make the bar exam a once-in-your-lifetime experience.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Conviser  
President & CEO