Congratulations And Best Of Luck MR. PRESIDENT

A Dangerous Conservative Precedent

By Patrick McCaffrey

The recent decision of the British Government to move to abolish the right of suspects in northeast Ireland to remain silent under police questioning, along with other repressive measures, has raised concerns that Britain’s own liberty could become the latest casualty in an 800 year war against her tiny neighbor. Legislation ending the centuries old right to silence has been introduced into the House of Commons, where a substantial Tory majority virtually guarantees its passage. The bill is expected to become law by early 1989.

Other government proposals would allow convictions based on the “opinion” of a single police officer of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (an organization whose record of brutality against the Nationalist community led President Carter to embargo all sales of arms to that para-military force), ban Sinn Fein from the airwaves, and require all candidates for office to take both an oath of allegiance to the British Crown and an oath not to support violence. (Or at least some forms of violence. For example, MP Ian Paisley’s recent call for the SAS to openly adopt a shoot to kill policy against suspected I.R.A. guerrillas presumably would not bar him from seeking office.) A law preventing the voters from electing prisoners to represent them has already been introduced. The Irish, it should be noted, have traditionally chosen current or former political prisoners as their leaders. Indeed at times such status has almost been a prerequisite for seeking important office. The ranks of those actually elected to office while in prison include Arthur Griffith, Eamonn deValera and Bobby Sands.

Thatcher’s move against the right to remain silent has received the most international attention. At present British Courts, including the no jury, one judge Diplock Courts in the north-eastern part of Ireland occupied by Britain, may not take into account that a suspect refused to answer questions. Under the new proposals a court could regard an accused’s refusal to answer police questions, or even a request for a lawyer, as evidence of guilt. Tory party spokesman Tom King, defending the government proposal, said that suspects are “being trained to refuse to respond to questions put by the police—and this technique is increasingly being adopted by those suspected of serious crimes.” Under the new law, continued King, a judge will be able to take from a suspects silence “what inferences seem proper.” Describing the right to silence as an “essential element of a free society”, Labor Party deputy leader Roy Hattersly warned: “To abolish the right of silence is to place a terrible risk against those that are afraid, who simply are cautious and wish to speak to a solicitor before saying anything.”

That Thatcher would move to curtail such fundamental rights in northeast Ireland is perhaps not surprising considering that her government’s human rights violations, shoot to kill policies, torture and degrading treatment of prisoners and suspects has long been condemned by Amnesty International and the European Parliament, among others. More unexpected is that the Prime Minister is said to be considering similar restrictions on the right to remain silent in England and Wales, with Scotland presumably next on the agenda. It is not implausible that all these proposals could, like the right to remain silent, eventually find their way home to England. Labor Party M.P. Kevin McNamara has warned that “Northern Ireland is being used as laboratory for draconian measures to be used later in other parts of the U.K.”

In a related move, the Thatcher government is preparing legislation that may allow suspects charged with membership in the Provisional Irish Republican Army to be found guilty based solely on the “opinion” of RUC officers. The need for such a law (continued on page 6)
November, 1988

Dear Law Student:

For the past 10 years, each Spring, BAR/BRI has offered a New York CPLR Review. The program was taught by Professor Irving Younger who, as you are probably aware, died last March.

We are pleased to announce that the tradition of the Younger CPLR program will continue.

Beginning this Spring, the CPLR program will be presented by Prof. Arthur Miller of The Harvard Law School. Prof. Miller, who is well known for his TV appearances, is also the author or co-author of about 30 books or treatises on the law, including the popular Weinstein Korn & Miller treatise on New York Civil Practice.

The program will be presented live in Manhattan on Sunday, March 4th from 9 AM to 5 PM at Town Hall, 123 W. 43rd St., (between 6th & Broadway) and on tape outside Manhattan shortly thereafter at locations with sufficient interest.

This program is an overview of New York Practice and Procedure. Prof. Miller will focus on the areas of New York Practice that are the most likely to be tested on the New York Bar Exam.

NOTE: PROF. MILLER’S CPLR PROGRAM IS SEPARATE FROM THE BAR/BRI NEW YORK BAR REVIEW COURSE. DURING THE BAR REVIEW, A BAR-ORIENTED CPLR LECTURE OF APPROXIMATELY 12 HOURS IS GIVEN OVER A PERIOD OF 4 DAYS.

The 1989 tuition for the CPLR program is $95. The tuition for BAR/BRI students is $45. However, for this year only any student who takes the BAR/BRI New York Summer 1989 Bar Review Course and who registers for that course by December 15, 1988 will be entitled to attend the CPLR program FREE OF CHARGE. Applications for this program will be available after the first of the year.

We are excited that Prof. Miller has agreed to present the BAR/BRI New York Practice program and we believe you will find this an excellent supplement to your preparation for the Bar Examination.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P.S. In light of the foregoing, our reps have asked us if we could extend the $150 early enrollment discount at your school. The answer is YES. The BAR/BRI discount will be extended through Wednesday, November 23rd. DON'T MISS IT!

HARCOURT BRAKE JOVANOVICH LAW GROUP
There exists the Career Placement sense of administrative guidance, students face at Fordham is the Center which guides students towards school — a career. The ends, however, do not necessarily justify the means.
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One dilemma that many law students face at Fordham is the absence of administrative guidance. There exists the Career Placement Center which guides students towards the ultimate goal of law school—a career. The ends, however, do not necessarily justify the means. The priority of a law school student, perhaps now only in theory, is education. It is at this point that Fordham law students suffer greatly. Despite a student’s wide choice of classes, neither specific guidelines nor administrative counselors are offered to assist the student. “Should I take classes to prepare myself for the Bar? Or should I take classes that interest me?” Some may find a happy middle ground between the two sets of classes, but the fact remains that a student cannot pursue his specific career goals without first passing the bar. Clearly, some desired courses must be sacrificed as third year approaches and fear permeates one’s selections. The bar review courses all suggest that they can prepare a law student for the bar without having taken any “bar” classes at school, but no guarantees are offered in the registration packet.

Contracts, Torts, Property, etc. are required courses and they do welcome first-year students to the pleasures of law school. But the problem is when the student is left to choose his courses without direction after the first year. Two issues arise: whether the student should pursue his own personal curriculum; and if so, which specific courses will help him achieve his specific goals? The administration does publish a list of recommended courses in each of several fields, e.g. international law, real estate. This generic breakdown of the courses is as helpful as telling a prospective interviewee to look his best. Does that mean—wear a suit? Get a haircut? Wear a solid shirt? Striped tie? Of course those questions are not terribly difficult to answer, either because you know the answer or you can ask someone. It is also a mistake you can afford to make, i.e. you learn from your past interviews. But as a law student prods on, he has no opportunity to learn from his mistakes— to rethink his choice of elective courses, or to say that a particular course did not benefit the particular goal and pursue another.

Guidance counselors should be appointed and every student assigned to one. Law school is a wonderful opportunity to specialize in a field of interest, but not by jeopardizing the bar. If a student has someone to turn to with experience, he’ll be more secure in his pursuits; if he fails to seek guidance, let the cards fall where they may. But let him have the chance.

Chief Justice Says He Is No Judge
By Alan Dershowitz

Well, Chief Justice William Rehnquist finally acknowledged what many Supreme Court observers have suspected for a long time. “I’m not a judge,” he reminded Patricia Unssin, a public defender from Chicago who was arguing on behalf of a criminal defendant. Unssin had made the unforgivable mistake of addressing the chief justice by the lowly title “judge.” That was too much for the usually unstuffy Rehnquist, who proceeded to humiliate the nervous lawyer by glaring down from his lofty perch behind the Oak Bench and declaring: “I’m the chief justice. I’m not a judge.”

Unssin had no choice but to apologize, since she was representing a client whose liberty might turn on a single vote—though not likely a favorable vote by the chief justice. The press reported that the argument—which had just begun—continued with “a chill in the air.” Rehnquist asked her no further questions. A law student who attended the argument reported to me that the shaken lawyer had difficulty recovering her composure. The lawyer says that at the moment of the rebuke she “felt like dying,” but that she thinks she went on to make a credible argument—at least to the other judges. (Whoops! Judges, Well, Excuse me.)

Some judges give women lawyers a particularly hard time, though there is no evidence that Rehnquist’s put-down was motivated by sexism. But his school-marmish insistence on proper etiquette does remind me of Phi.D.s who insist on being called “doctor” and TV evangelists who demand the title “ reverend.” Most self-confident professionals I know are perfectly comfortable with their names and do not need elitist titles to make them feel secure. Many, though certainly not all, judges insist on being called “Your Honor” and demand that lawyers begin their argument with the reverential preface “May it please the court.”

Rehnquist’s predecessor, Warren Burger, used to complain when he was introduced merely as the “chief justice of the Supreme Court.” “I am the chief justice of the United States,” he would insist.

Beyond the obnoxiousness of his uncalled-for put down, Rehnquist was wrong as a matter of constitutional law. Article II of the Constitution expressly provides for the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court “not justices.” As a staunch advocate of literal interpretations of the Constitution’s words, he should insist on being called by his constitutional title: “judge.”

Rehnquist is also wrong as a matter of dictionary usage. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “judge” as the generic term for persons occupying any judicial office, except for “persons presiding judicially in inferior courts who are usually called justices or magistrates.” In the United States, the dictionary adds, the title of judge is also applied to “a justice of the Supreme Court.” But perhaps there is some subtle truth to Rehnquist’s insistence on not being called “judge,” despite the plain words of the Constitution and the dictionary. Rehnquist is widely regarded by

Dear Janice:

I love you. Keep up the good work.

Forever yours,

Miss P.
...And The Home Of The Brave"

By William Bryk

Upper Central Park remains much as it was during the years of the American Revolution. North of 100 Street, the park's East Drive even follows the route of the old Post Road. At 107 Street, it goes through a rocky outcrop.

This is McCown's Pass, once among the city's most important strategic points. During the last months of the War of 1812, New Yorkers fortified it and upper Manhattan was in constant contact with the British in invasion.

Today, above Harlem Meer in southeastern Central Park, Blockhouse No.1, sole survivor of the forts built in the summer of 1814, still waits for the British to come.

Only 38 years before, the Redcoats had easily invaded New York and forced Washington from the city. Accordingly, the Americans heavily fortified the harbor after the British left in 1813.

Upper Manhattan, however, remained undefended for two years after Congress' declaration of war in June, 1812.

Then the Royal Navy bombarded Stonington, Connecticut on August 10, 1814. The authorities panicked. If the British were in force on the Sound, they might land in Westchester or upper Manhattan and attack the City. After all, they'd done it before.

Eight days later, civilian volunteers began building the uprooted fortifications. They included "...almost every conceivable class of men—the Society of Tammany, the students of Columbia College, medical students, butchers, members of the bar, Free Masons, Jugglers..."

For example, in late September, 1814, the Master Butcher's Association, which had also worked on Brooklyn's emergency fortifications, set out "bright and early...on their six-mile march for Harlem, headed by a brass band. They carried a large banner bearing the inscription 'Friends of Our Country/Free Trade and Butchers' Rights/From Brooklyn's Fields to Harlem Heights.' By sundown they had thrown up a breastwork about 100 feet long, 20 feet thick and four feet high."

They built a chain of batteries and blockhouses from Benson's Point (today's Benjamin Franklin Plaza) at Third Avenue and 106 Street to Manhattanhenge (today's Morningside Houses) near the northeast corner of 124 Street and West End Avenue.

In what is now Central Park, they built gates and batteries at McCown's Pass and a network of little forts, all linked by earthworks: Fort Clinton, with three guns, overlooking Harlem Creek; Fort Fish, with five heavy guns, overlooking both creek and pass; and Nutter's Battery, just south of the creek, with one gun. Blockhouse No.1, off to the northwest, had a sunken roof on which was "a single heavy gun traversing parabolically"—meaning one mounted to fire over the parapet in any direction. Nearly 2,000 troops garrisoned the fortifications.

On February 11, 1815, New York learned that the Treaty of Ghent had been signed ending the war. The guns were removed and the forts abandoned almost over night. As with all Manhattan's post-Revolutionary defenses, none had fired a shot in anger.

Today, nothing remains of these fortifications outside Central Park. A blockhouse stood as late as 1905 on a rocky bluff in Morningside Park near 123 Street, where Morningside School now stands.

Of the forts about McCown's Pass, almost nothing remains. Parks Department maps show Fort Fish and Nutter's Battery. But the emplacements are gone. Neither has a monument. One may still discern traces of the connecting earthworks through the trees.
"HOW TO MAXIMIZE YOUR SCORES On First Year Exams"

Date: Thurs. Nov 10
Time: 3PM - 4PM
Room: 204 Live Presentation

PROFESSOR CHARLES H. WHITEBREAD

from the University of Southern California Law Center reveals the practical aspects of perfecting your exam-taking skills.

PROFESSOR WHITEBREAD is an alumnus of Princeton University and Yale Law School. He formerly taught at the University of Virginia Law School, and his written works include Criminal Procedure (Foundation Press). Professor Whitebread is a national lecturer for BAR/BRI bar review.
Are Women Lawyers Barred From The Ladder Of Success?

By Catherine Lottko

The Honorable Judith S. Kaye, the first woman Associate Justice on the New York State Court of Appeals, spoke on October 6, 1988 at the Noreen E. McNamara Memorial Lecture Series in McNally Amphitheater. Judge Kaye’s address was entitled “Women Attorneys in Big Firms: A Study in Progress in Gender Equality.”

Judge Kaye was optimistic that recent efforts toward eliminating gender discrimination in large law firms could become a model for all of society. These efforts include part-time work opportunities (commonly referred to as the “Mommy Track”), awareness among attorneys of potential bias, meetings of women within firms to discuss discrimination and other issues, and panels on such social issues as parental care, pornography and custody. Part-time employment, however, is still not common at most large firms.

Judge Kaye was candid about the history of discrimination against female attorneys, which continued into this decade. Yet she remained optimistic that women today had increased opportunities in the law. “Women today genuinely have a partnership prospect— even if it is a realistic option for only a few.”

Judge Kaye felt women have successfully obtained positions in prestigious firms, but are now faced with another barrier— advancement prospects within the firm. “One-third of associates today are women, however, less than eight per cent of partners in large firms are women,” she said. She cited a recent survey of a Harvard Law graduating class: only one-quarter of the women were partners in large firms, while over half of the men held such positions. These statistics also held true for professorships and judgeships. This is what Judge Kaye referred to as “glass ceilings”, women in law today can see the top, but they cannot reach it.

Judge Kaye felt there was no single cause for this stratification in the legal profession. In the large firms, where an associate’s value is equivalent to the number of hours billed, women who are raising families cannot successfully compete and advance to partnership. However, she noted that as more women enter the profession and as the social climate changes, women are questioning whether the long hours, the internal pressures, the conflicts between business needs and professional ethics are worth the cost of less time with family and diminished leisure time and social life.

“Equal treatment,” said Judge Kaye, “does not mean everyone should be treated the same.” While women’s differences were once the basis for discriminatory treatment, today the “recognition of these differences is essential to true gender equality.” Twenty years ago, questions regarding marital and family status were used to keep women out of large firms. Today candidates for employment question the firms about their policies for associates with families. A woman’s concern about family is no longer regarded as a lack of competence. As Judge Kaye pointed out, women today have a stronger voice, not just a different one.

Why Worry?

This year, another bar review course has put out a poster inducing students who have already signed up with other bar review courses to switch programs.

BAR/BRI refuses to play this game.

We believe that students are mature enough to enroll in a course. If they believe they made a mistake, they are mature enough to change courses.

If a student signs up with BAR/BRI or with any other bar review course, that student’s objective is to pass the bar exam. And our obligation as attorneys is to help them with that objective, and not to destroy their confidence in themselves and in their course.

We will not undermine students’ confidence in their course by playing on their insecurities.

After all, we’re attorneys. And we intend to help you become attorneys, too.
IT'S NOT TOO LATE TO
SWITCH TO PIEPER
WITHOUT LOSS OF DEPOSIT.

So, you've made a mistake. If you were lured into another bar review course by a sales pitch in your first or second year, and now want to SWITCH TO PIEPER, then your deposit with that other bar review course will not be lost.

Simply register for PIEPER and send proof of your payment to the other bar review course (copy of your check with an affirmation that you have not and do not anticipate receiving a refund). You will receive a dollar for dollar credit for up to $150 toward your tuition in the PIEPER BAR REVIEW.

For more information see your Pieper Representatives or telephone

(516) 747-4311

PIEPER NEW YORK-MULTISTATE
BAR REVIEW, LTD.

90 Willis Avenue, Mineola, New York 11501
Beef Up Your Job Search II

By Brian Kirby and David Leibell

Now that the On Campus Interview Program is all but over, many students who participated found themselves in employment positions themselves. One student who did not (i.e. without job offers). While participants have, in most instances, realized the benefit of interview experience, they have yet to face the sting of rejection and the loss of confidence that accompanies it.

The natural tendency for students in this position is to deal with their job search in the easiest, most painless way possible: by not dealing with it. The search for any job in the law is generally a time-consuming and somewhat unpleasant process. However, it is a process which requires actual participation to achieve results.

Fortunately there is help. The Law School’s Career Planning Center assists students in developing individualized job search strategies to secure the type of job they desire. Carol Vecchio, director of the Center, has been a member of the Career Planning Center (C.P.C.) staff since 1983. She has an undergraduate degree in psychology and has trained with the position the student is seeking. This meeting is generally a turn-around allows students to get mine of what they are having difficulty in. In the law, there is help. Fortunately there is help.

The C.P.C. provides certain advisory services and programs which can improve a student’s performance or in the critical elements of the interview. The C.P.C. has found by increasing his or her chances of securing a job.

The Moch Interview Program is but one of the valuable services the C.P.C. provides Law School students. After learning the nature of the position the student is interested in, the C.P.C. schedules him or her for an interview. On the date of the appointment, the student arrives prepared to be the best interview. The student is then interviewed by an outside legal consultant, and the interview is recorded on videotape. The consultant and the C.P.C. staff member make notes regarding the student’s performance and discuss their observations with the student at the interview’s conclusion. After watching the videotape, additional comments are made and answers to especially difficult questions are suggested. The entire program takes just over an hour and has proved to be exceedingly valuable for those who have difficulty in presenting and expressing themselves in an interview situation.

Mail Campaign

The Overnight Resume and Overnight Cover Letter Critiquing service available at the C.P.C. can help students compose the informative resume and the well-written cover letter necessary for a successful mail campaign. A C.P.C. staff member provides written comments and suggestions on how to improve the wording and appearance of a student’s resume and cover letter before they are being mailed. The quick-turn-around allows students to get opinions on last minute changes to their resumes and cover letters before they are being mailed.

The C.P.C. recommends starting a mail campaign sometime around the middle of October, as most firms have completed their on-campus interviews by that time and have a better idea about the number of students they need to hire. Contrary to popular opinion, targeted mail campaigns of 20-25 letters have proven to be more successful than the 100-200 letter茫然 campaign that many students have embraced. Instead of writing to the hiring partners of the targeted firms, Carol, Tom and Kathy recommend that students write to the large regional firms and general practice firms. To that end, the C.P.C. has compiled lists of the Law School Alumni at firms and corporations in New York and throughout the country for students’ use. Carol also recommends that students follow up the mail campaign with phone calls approximately two weeks after the letters are sent.

Job Books

The C.P.C. receives descriptions of over 1,500 part-time, summer and full-time legal positions throughout the year. Many of these listings relate to the positions at small firms, to those having the time or manpower to interview on campus. This is a readily available resource that most students overlook.

Personal Contacts

The word on personal contacts is that if a student has them, he or she should use them. Although the Center does not supply students with personal contacts, it does conduct several functions which are essential to a successful job search. The Career Dinner Program allows students in all classes to meet and eat with alumni practicing in a particular area of the law. The dinners will be scheduled throughout the spring semester.

In addition to the above-described programs, the C.P.C. provides job placement related services for Law School Alumni. Although 97% of Fordham Law School graduates have jobs within nine months of graduation, many find themselves unhappy with their situations several years later. The students who are unable to get jobs and the alumni who are unhappy with their jobs generally share one common trait: an improper job search.

According to Carol, the key to getting a rewarding job is a knowledge of how to get hired. Implicit in that knowledge is a knowledge of oneself and of one’s interests. The firms that base their hiring decisions on grades are a minority, albeit a highly visible one. A student who is able to improve his grades during the quick-turn-around third and years is looked on very favorably by the majority of the firms, and should have little trouble in securing a desired position with the right approach. The most important thing to remember is that neither grades nor summer experience are determinative of one’s legal future, despite impressions to the contrary. As Carol observed, “It isn’t over ‘til it’s over, and it’s never over.”

Attention: Evening Division Students

History

The Evening Division was opened in the fall of 1912 when the school was located at 140 Nassau Street in the City Hall area. The classes were the held 5 nights a week and the program lasted 3 years. Tuition was $100 per annum.

In the mid-1930s, the program was expanded to a fourth year of study and the class days were decreased from 5 nights to 4 nights each week. For a period of time in the 1930s, evening classes were held both in Manhattan and at the Rose Hill Campus in the Bronx.

The alumni of the Evening Division now number over 3000. The Evening Division currently (and historically) has made up approximately one-third of the student body. It has been the tradition (with rare exception and for good reason) that all required courses be taught by full-time faculty members. Admission requirement are the same for day and evening divisions.

Among the graduates of the division are numerous partners of major law firms, corporate general counsels, a Governor of New York State, several members of the U.S. House of Representatives (including Hon. Eugene Keogh ’30-originator of the Keogh Plan), Federal and State jurists and several faculty members of distinguished law schools.

The Evening Division celebrated its 75th anniversary with a benefit dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Almost 1000 people attended this gala event held in the spring of 1987.

Special Services and Hours

In Fordham’s efforts to provide an excellent education in the evening while adapting to the restricted schedules of many evening students, you should be aware of the following special arrangements:

Faculty—All faculty members are available for telephone consultation. Students are provided with the telephone numbers of all faculty in the Directory of Faculty and for the full-time faculty in the Student Handbook. Faculty members may wish to schedule appointments to meet with you personally at a mutually convenient time.

Library—The Kissam Law Library is open until 1 A.M. each night. The circulation desk is open each night (except Saturday).

For more information see your Pieper Representatives or contact:

PIEPER NEW YORK-MULTISTATE BAR REVIEW, LTD.
90 WILLS AVENUE, MINEOGL, NEW YORK 11501
Telephone: (516) 747-4311
The Bar Course That Cares.
THREE REASONS

WHY MORE STUDENTS ARE CHOOSING KAPLAN-SMH BAR REVIEW COURSE

1 INTENSIVE QUESTION REVIEW: Over eighteen hours of in-class question analysis by experienced law school professors is an integral part of every SMH and Kaplan-SMH Bar Review course at no extra cost.

2 NARRATIVE TEXTS: The law you need to know for your bar exam is explained for you—not outlined—in our comprehensive texts.

3 UNPARALLELED CONVENIENCE: Preparation for the bar exams of nineteen jurisdictions is available at over 100 Stanley H. Kaplan Educational Centers nationwide (except in New England, D.C., Maryland, and New Mexico where courses are administered by SMH).

PREPARATION FOR


If you plan to practice in any of these jurisdictions, your first step should be to contact your campus rep or your local Stanley Kaplan Educational Center.

STANLEY H.
KAPLAN-SMH BAR REVIEW SERVICES

(800) 223·1782  (800) 343·9188

See your Campus Rep, or call:
STANLEY KAPLAN ED. CENTER
131 West 56th Street
New York, NY 10019
212/977-8200
Chief Justice...
(continued from page 3)

defense lawyers as a prosecutor in robbery. He nearly always sides with the government and he often helps the prosecution make its case. Many defense lawyers do not regard him as a "judge"—in the sense of a neutral arbiter of constitutional rights—in criminal cases.

Indeed it was precisely because both Richard Nixon, who originally appointed him to the Supreme Court, and Ronald Reagan, who later named him to chief justice, believed that he would not be a neutral judge in criminal cases—that he would side with the prosecution—that he is where he is today. Nixon appointed because of his reputation as an extreme-right-wing ideologue, a lawyer who had recommended declaring "qualified martial law" during anti-war demonstrations in Washington. Reagan promoted him to chief justice because of his consistent record of voting against the rights of criminal defendants—a record of one-sidedness unequalled by any other chief because of his consistent record of voting against the rights of criminal defendants—a record of one-sidedness unequalled by any other

In the profession of doing justice, there is no more noble title than that of judge. In some parts of the country, great lawyers who do not sit on the bench are called by the honorific title "judge." It is a title that has to be earned by respect, not mandated by political appointment. Justice Hugo Black—one of the greatest Supreme Court justices in our history—preferred to be called "judge," rather than "Mr. Justice," precisely because it was an earned accolade rather than a formal title.

Even religious literature refer to God as "Sovereign and Judge." The title may be good enough for God, but not quite sufficient for William Rehnquist's elevated ego. This will simply suggest the following variant on the old joke about the Angel Gabriel sending for the heavenly psychiatrist because God was having delusions of grandeur—he believed he was the chief justice of the United States.

William Rehnquist is the chief justice. He should be called by that formal title, although he needs intermittent nervous lawyers while they are arguing on behalf of their clients. Perhaps some day, if William Rehnquist continues the movement toward the court's center reflected in some decisions since his promotion to chief justice, he will actually deserve the noble title "judge.

Alan M. Dershowitz is a professor of law at Harvard University.

By David Wischart
Senior Staff Writer

U2 Finds What They're Looking For

By registering for a Kaplan-SMH bar review course in your first year of law school, you are entitled to 50% off the lowest advertised price. SMH Law School Summaries I and II are ready to claim their destiny as the world's greatest living rock band. After the one-two combo of "Bullet the Blue Sky" and "Killing in a Stand Still" (arguably the best tracks of The Joshua Tree), the claim seems convincing. Unfortunately, the film loses much of its potency when the Top Ten hits start surfacing. While "Sunday Bloody Sunday" and "Pride (In the Name of Love)", clearly requisite, the greatest-hits sequence could easily be reduced by half. Not that these aren't good songs—especially for residents of the pop charts—but over-familiarity and a lack of re-interpretation diminishes the impact of the film as a whole. U2 Rattle and Hum is still a pleasant surprise, however. Yes it's commercialism, yes, it propagandas. But it's also quite good. Though the sound quality is uneven, it certainly looks great, especially the grainy black and white. Joanou does a splendid job with the editing, and follows that cardinal rule of MTV camera style: when in doubt, move about.

Despite some minor lapses, U2 Rattle and Hum maintains a joy to watch and a joy to hear. It's myth-making on an epic scale.
Presenting Marino Comprehensive.

Your palms sweat. Suddenly, your mouth becomes a mirror of the Sahara Desert. Your eyes feel like overactive ping pong balls, as you glance furtively around the room.

Welcome to the bar exam.

Marino Comprehensive: All You Need To Know, All You Need, To Pass.

Marino Comprehensive New York & Marino Comprehensive New Jersey are the first and only completely self-contained bar review programs, covering all aspects of preparation for the N.Y. & N.J. exams. These courses were created to satisfy the very different requirements of each state's test. And both are taught according to The Marino Method: Joe Marino's highly successful, interactive approach to problem solving. This includes personal attention to each student, every step of the way.

Presenting Marino Comprehensive, New York.

This 4-component program consists of our N.Y. BARPASS REVIEW (a full-service bar course complete with MBE and essay practice seminars), MARINO PLUS (the latest generation of our highly acclaimed Substantive Writing & Analysis Course), MARINO CPLR WORKSHOP, and MARINO MBE CLINICS. You'll receive over 170 class hours, including over 40 substantive lectures. You'll be taken through 75 essays (17 of which are graded) complete with model answers, 1,000 N.Y. and MBE hypotheticals, 2,000 independent MBE practice questions, practice exams and more. And the entire program is backed up by Marino books, which are rapidly becoming the gold standard of bar review publications. Simply stated, Marino Comprehensive is unequalled by any other course or combination of courses.

Presenting Marino Comprehensive, New Jersey.

Like its N.Y. counterpart, Marino Comprehensive N.J. is unequalled by any other course or combination of courses. Its components include our N.J. BARPASS REVIEW (a full-service bar course complete with MBE and essay practice seminars), MARINO PLUS (the latest evolution of our highly respected New Jersey Essay Writing Workshop), and Marino's unique MBE CLINIC. Over 110 hours of class time is supported by 28 lectures (covering all subjects found on the N.J. exam), plus 12 essays which are carefully graded by Joe Marino and staff. Additionally, hundreds of lecture hypotheticals will be presented, along with 2,000 MBE practice questions and a practice exam. And the entire program is backed up by Marino books, which are rapidly becoming the gold standard of bar review publications.

Marino Comprehensive: One Course, One Price.

With Marino Comprehensive you'll pay one fee and that's all. There are no add-ons, no ancillary or material costs, no other courses to take or payments to make. Just the most thorough and thoroughly successful bar exam preparation you can get, anywhere.

BAR/BRI
STUDENTS
PASS
THE
BAR