



Harvard Law Record

Volume 90, No. 6

America's Oldest Law School Newspaper

April 11, 1990

Students Protest Dean On Diversity

Students Stage
Second Sit-In

By Linda Popejoy

About 80 students protesting a lack of faculty diversity on Monday took over Griswold Hall for the second time and vowed to stay overnight, despite a dramatic afternoon plea from Dean Robert Clark '72 and three professors that they go home and stop "disrupting" the law school.

Students began to bed down late Monday night in conditions that were far more uncomfortable than during the sit-in last Thursday. Uniformed Harvard police sealed the building and refused to allow supporters to bring in food, blankets, or medicine. One woman who had a migraine headache was told she could leave, but could not have medicine brought in. She insisted on staying, and at 11:30 she was taken away in an ambulance.

Students did not have telephone contact with the outside. By midnight many students were drinking water out of bathroom taps.

"They are trying to make it as difficult as possible for us," said Maurice Hoo, a third-year student.

Spirits were still high around midnight. Students were singing "We Shall Overcome" and Dayenu in honor of Passover.

The emotional confrontation between Clark and about 100 students began at 3:45 p.m. in the lobby on the second floor of Griswold Hall, where the students had begun their sit-in after a day of protest in several campus buildings, including one outside a lunch for dozens of new admits.



Dean Robert Clark '72 escaping from students and press.

The students were in the Griswold lobby after being locked out of Clark's office by several security officers.

Clark, who was followed by the group of students for much of the afternoon, emerged from his locked office at 3:45 p.m. to speak with students packed shoulder to shoulder in the Griswold lobby. With him were Profs. Martha Minow, Randall Kennedy, and Daniel Meltzer.

Clark told the students their tactics were "disrupting the normal functioning of the law school and I can't approve of that." He urged students to work through "normal" channels to achieve their primary goal of getting the law school to hire a woman of color by the fall of this year.

Although the professors expressed sympathy to the goals of the students to change fac-

tics.

"That makes me mad," shouted second-year student Moanaca Caston to Clark. "My perspective is that 107 black women are being disrupted because they do not have a professor who can tell them what it is really like to be a black woman in the real world. I feel disrupted so I don't mind disrupting you."

Clark, who has run into political trouble with the students all year, appears to have fueled student anger by appearing with Profs. Minow and Kennedy.

Kennedy is one of three tenured black professors at Harvard but a recent article attacking non-traditional scholarship has made him less popular with many minority students. Minow, who is generally supportive of progressive causes, seemed to surprise many stu-

dents with her unqualified support of the dean.

"They came to pander to us," said Ursula Dudley, 2L. "It's pretty obvious he paraded them out to appease students. What it ended up doing is convincing the students who were sitting on the fence that we should continue the sit-in."

Earlier Monday about 150 students held a rally in front of the Hark after the dean rejected their pared down list of three demands from the sit-in last

Thursday. The demands ask that a firing decision on Regina Austin be made before the end of the academic year, that a woman of color be added to the faculty by the fall, and that the faculty scrap a rule that delays the hiring of visiting professors for at least one year after they finish teaching.

At the rally, several students said they chose the route of protest only because they perceive that so little progress has

Continued on page 12

Conference Focuses On Family Law Issues

By Jacqueline Hays

"This is a call to action. We all must work to keep women and children from being safer on the streets than they are in their own homes," Sarah Buel, 3L, Founder and Co-Director of the HLS Battered Women's Advocacy Project challenged the over 400 participants who attended the Lawyers for Children in the 1990's National Conference this past weekend in Ames Courtroom.

The two-day conference was presented by the HLS Children and Family Rights Project and co-sponsored by the American Bar Association as well as several children's advocacy organizations nation-wide. Suzy Groisser, President of the Family Rights Project, explained the urgency of their purpose. "We want to encourage attorneys and students to go into family law because so many of the issues that this country

must face are rooted in this field. We have to confront these problems head on."

Dean Robert Clark '72 welcomed the participants Saturday morning, praising children's advocates for their dedication and hailing them "the best of the profession." Attorneys, administrators, judges and students gathered from across the country to listen to panel discussions on topics such as the roles and responsibilities of judges and attorneys in child advocacy; the challenges of administering effective guardian programs; multi-cultural issues in child representation; and the correlation between domestic violence, substance abuse, child abuse, and juvenile delinquency.

Judge Patricia Wald of the U.S. Court of Appeals, DC Circuit, while acknowledging limited progress in the field of children's rights, expressed the impatience that she shares with

other child advocates in her keynote address. "The bitter fact is that the status of children in America has deteriorated over the past several decades. Every day 211 children are arrested for drug abuse, 135,000 children bring a gun to school, 1,800 children are abused or neglected, and 3,300 children run away from home. There has been a 210 percent increase in reported sexual abuse of children in the eighties alone; 1,200 children died from abuse and neglect last year." These grim statistics, as many of the speakers agree, reflect a tradition of reluctance of the courts to intervene in what has historically been considered the most private segment of society: the family. In addition, "the potential for abuse and arbitrariness in the institutions that govern children's lives" have hindered rather than helped the situation. "Family law too often

Continued on page 12

Students Vote On 5 Referendum

HLS students go to the polls today to decide the fate of 5 referenda items, ranging from the high-profile politically volatile to the procedurally mundane. Following is a nutshell look at the issues upon which students will vote. ("Binding" referenda are mandates to the LSC to attempt to implement. "Non-binding" are simply opinion polls and do not mandate any action from the LSC)

BINDING REFERENDA ISSUES

PUBLIC SERVICE

A proposal to add an undetermined number of hours of pro bono/public service practice to its Professional Responsibility Requirement, beginning with the class entering in the fall of 1991. An indication of whether credit should be given will also be voted upon.

FLY-OUT WEEK REJECTION

A proposal evaluating the recently revised academic schedule which reserves one week for interviewing at the expense of several holidays and exam reading week days.

The first question proposes that if the fly-out week should be maintained, should the academic schedule restore

- 1) both the holidays and the reading week days
- 2) the reading week days
- 3) the holidays
- 4) neither

The second question proposes whether the fly-out week should be abandoned if that is the only way to restore the holidays and reading week days.

FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE REQUIREMENT

A proposal to reduce the number of years to 5 years from the current 7 year requirement. Harvard requires a student to be financially independent from his or her parents in order to qualify as "independent" for financial aid purposes. This is one condition which determines the availability of student grants.

NON-BINDING ("POLL")

REFERENDA ISSUES

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CHOICE

A proposal to call on the Supreme Court and the President to "remedy" recent decisions by the Supreme Court which have set back protection of civil rights and restricted a woman's right to choose an abortion.

DISBAND THE LSC

A proposal to disband the Law School Council.

Inside

Public Service	Page 6
Disband LSC	Page 7
Abortion & Civil Rights ..	Page 8

THE GOLD CARD® A SPECIAL MEMBERSHIP OPPORTUNITY.



FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS EXCLUSIVELY.

Take advantage of this special opportunity to become a Gold Card member. American Express will approve your application based upon your status as a graduate student. Your acceptance will not be dependent on employment and income history. As long as you have no negative credit history and no negative American Express experience, you can soon be carrying the Gold Card.

And you need only call to apply. Any time, day or night, 24 hours a day. There is no lengthy application to complete.

Once you receive the Gold Card, you can begin enjoying the many benefits of this distinguished membership, including: Worldwide check-cashing privileges. Emergency Card replacement (usually by the next business day). A complimentary 24-hour, toll-free travel service. As well as insurance protection for your Gold Card purchases.

The Gold Card. Available to you now on this exclusive basis from American Express. Call today to apply.

The Gold Card®
1-800-648-4420



Welfare Mother Brings Campaign For Governor To HLS

By Greg Dingens

In an age of avaricious political campaigning where the size of the candidate's treasury means much more than her ideas and ideals, long-time welfare-rights activist and current welfare recipient Dottie Stevens brought her uniquely humble gubernatorial campaign to Harvard last Wed., unabashedly promoting single-minded politics and selling campaign buttons for one dollar.

Speaking before a small crowd, Stevens, a 48 year old single mother of four, spun folksy personal tales of her own reliance on the welfare system around her campaign themes, which not incidentally focus solely on poverty and welfare rights. Her platform issues include higher payments for families on public assistance, a \$10 minimum wage, and universal child care.

Claiming to be "one of those long-time welfare recipients you've all heard about and are supposed to be so terrible," Stevens refused to be apologetic for being on welfare for the past eleven years despite receiving an undergraduate degree in human services planning and presently earning her masters degree from the College of Public and Community Service at U-Mass, Boston. "Welfare should not be a shame. It's a shame that welfare isn't enough to support a family."

Despite the fact that she has raised only \$1,500 dollars for her war chest, can't afford to buy a suit in which to campaign, and has a tiny campaign staff which must hold other full-time jobs, Stevens hopes to gather enough petition signatures to earn a spot on the Democratic primary ballot.

"This is no symbolic campaign," insisted Steven's campaign secretary Jonathan King, an MIT professor. "Dottie on the ballot shakes the whole ballot. It makes ours a democracy with capital 'D,' which scares people."



Dottie Stevens, candidate for Governor.

Currently a vice-president of both the National Welfare Rights Union and the Greater Boston Legal Services, Stevens has a long, impressive list of poverty and welfare activism. Her past laurels include the president's post a the Coalition for Basic Human Needs (CBHN), a state-wide welfare rights organization, and founder of the local student group Advocacy for Modern Survival. She has been heavily involved in the creation and promotion of the "Up To Poverty Now" campaign, and is presently a board member of CBHN, Greater Boston Legal Services, and the City Mission Society.

While obliquely denying that she is running a one-issue campaign, Stevens' discussion focused on the inadequacies of the current welfare system and declared the reason for her entry into the gubernatorial race was "because the Governor is the only one with enough authority to enact emergency legislation to get the payments to the people."

"If I'm elected," she added, "the first thing I will do is deduct ten percent of my salary to put into the welfare funds, and challenge (other officials) to do the same." She added that she would use the rest of her salary to repay \$34,000 in school loans.

Stevens said she is part of a national movement to elect "victims," which is an effort to elect poor or disadvantaged candidates directly into office to directly address the needs of the poverty-stricken and oppressed. Candidates in 32 other states are involved in this effort under the label "A Victim's Call to Action," running campaigns in various local and state-wide elections, she said.

Calling her a "sister of social justice," Steven's campaign manager, Jeanne Dever, also a longtime welfare recipient and activist, stressed the grass-roots appeal of her candidate's campaign. "This campaign is not about electing Dottie Stevens to Governor," she exclaimed. "This campaign is about bringing some moral, ethical questions about

what we're doing to people in society." Stevens challenged the currently held perception of Massachusetts as a state in fiscal crisis, claiming that the state is very wealthy but that its budgetary priorities must be changed. "It's that trickle-down theory which you hear about but which never trickles down on us" which is the problem, she said.

Stevens remains optimistic about her long-shot chance as an anti-establishment candidate. "If the Democratic Party is true to its roots," she predicted, "I will win."

Type A Team, Woody Guthrie Argue Their Way To Finals

The Ames Moot Court Semi-Finals took place on March 21 and 22. *Cynthia Tracy v. State of Ames*, a child endangerment case, was successfully argued by the respondent Type A Team, whose members are: Maura R. Barry, John Jongbae Bu, Michael J. Savitz, Mike Zevenberger, Stephen R. Parkinson (oralist), and Rhoda L. Weeks (oralist). Weeks said that so far the work has been worth it. "It's been fun; hopefully finals will be as much fun." Weeks is not particularly nervous about next semester's finals. "It's just a matter of being prepared," she said.

The other winners were the members of the Woody Guthrie Team, respondent in the case of *Rachel S.C. Bell v. U.S.*. Members are Arti Rai, Miles Tolbert, Timothy Moran, Michael Best (oralist), Cynthia Monaco (oralist) and Gregory Weingart. Team member Weingart thinks the oralists are looking forward to the final round this fall, despite the heavy round involved. (When asked about the work put into preparation for the argument, Weingart just laughed). "I think they're excited," he said. "Not that many people get the chance to argue before a Supreme Court Justice."

DON'T MISS OUT

Your last chance to lock in savings of up to
\$200 for your bar review course is

May 4, 1990

For more information contact any campus rep or call our office.

GET THE EDGE!

SMH
BAR REVIEW

(800) 343-9188 outside MA (800) 453-2266 within MA

Clark

THE REFERENDUM: Public Service Requirement

Vote Yes On Pro Bono

Opponents of the public service requirement will have you believe that a yes vote on this week's referendum will doom western civilization. Harvard Law School as we know it will go down the tubes, to be replaced by an ECIIP dictatorship and the forced collectivization of student labor for liberal causes. The production of

**Julia Gordan
Proponent**

knowledge will drop dramatically and books might even disappear from our library system.

Something close to this frightening scenario is being propagated by a group of negativists on the student right, who seem to delight in creating a ten-headed monster out of a benign proposal that has won the near unanimous backing of the faculty at four other law schools, including Penn and Tulane, and is being considered by the faculty at 20 other law schools.

The program at Tulane, the first in the country, was given a special award by the American Bar Association for exemplary public service. According to Julie Jackson, the program director, 90 percent of the students who completed the requirement were satisfied with the program.

Yet, it is this public service concept that the gang of negativists has painted as "deeply authoritarian" and "dangerous." Some have suggested the program is an attempt to impose "politically correct" values on the student body. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The reason is that there is no program developed for Harvard. Penn has its own version, as do Tulane, Valparaiso and Florida State. The idea behind the referendum is to see if there is enough student support for the concept for the faculty, which has the final word on curricular matters to take the time to work out the details of a Harvard-specific program.

That is not to say that the public service requirement as a concept is flawless, or that the Tulane model is transferable to a school as large as Harvard. There are grounds for constructive criticism, and the proposal as put forth by the Law School Council is open-ended in order to encourage student and faculty participation. But criticism should be based on reason, not scare tactics.

Let's look at what a possible public service program might mean for you and for Harvard Law School, based on the model adopted by Penn.

First, the architects of the Penn public service program emphasized that it was educational in nature. By doing a certain number of hours of pro bono legal work before graduation, the argument goes, students will gain not only the practical skills to do pro bono work later in life, but also an awareness that entry to the profession implies an ethical obligation recognized by the ABA and every state bar in

the country.

Second, the public service program recognizes that a lawyer's willingness to meet this ethical obligation speaks directly to his or her competence as a lawyer. Since the purpose of law school is to teach lawyer competence, it is appropriate that law schools have a public service aspect as part of their curriculum.

Third, the actual time commitment at Penn is in keeping with the recommended ABA commitment to pro bono work, which require 34 hours over the course of the academic year. The upper limit is at Penn, which requires 35 hours over the course of the academic year.

Fourth, to the extent students choose to do legal services work, the program has the secondary benefit of ameliorating the legal services crisis in America. Currently nine out of ten Americans cannot afford a lawyer. The Penn program adds 15,000 hours of free legal work to Philadelphia every year.

Some members of the gang of negativists have criticized the public service program as "political" because most students will fulfill the requirement by doing legal services for the poor. The reality is that the requirement allows students to choose whatever work they wish, as long as it is legal in nature and unpaid. If this result in more services to the poor, all humanitarians should applaud.

It is important to emphasize the program is non-partisan and not political. ECIIP has made it clear any Harvard program should stay that way. I hope most students decide to help an American in need, but what is most important is that each student have the freedom to choose the type of work he or she feels most comfortable with. This means the NAACP; it includes civil and criminal legal services; staffing divorce, immigration, and other pro se legal clinics; liberal and conservative issues groups, government service; and work with private attorneys on their pro bono cases.

Another positive aspect of the program is that it is extremely cost-effective. It will be supervised "free" by private attorneys who take student placements, as is being done in New Orleans for the Tulane students. If Harvard wishes, it can also hire fulltime clinical professors to supervise the program.

The language of the Harvard referendum reads: "Harvard Law School should add a practice element to its Professional Responsibility Requirement. Beginning with the class entering Fall 1991, all Harvard students will perform a certain number of hours of pro bono/public service work over the course of the second and third years of law school in order to graduate." Do you agree?

The choice is yours.

Pro Choice Pro Bono

Pro bono is not political. Mandatory pro bono is political. Those who believe that students should be free to pursue their own visions of morality, who believe that choice beats coercion, and who are offended by utopian schemes that seek to inculcate ideologically correct values should vote NO on the

**Ron Edquist
Opponent**

mandatory pro bono referendum.

This referendum concerns only one prong of a six-point plan contained in a white paper approved and submitted by Law School Council and ECIIP to the faculty and administration. ECIIP faculty lobbyists have flatly stated that the plan is supported by 75 percent of the student body (verdict first—trial later). The plan calls for massive financial outlays funded by tuition increases in order to give generous, non-need based financial support to a narrow range of students. The plan seeks to politicize the admissions process. The plan recommends abolishing existing first-year electives such as federal litigation, administrative law and legal history in favor of a narrow range of "new electives" that would not be appropriate for many students. If you feel that this mischaracterizes the plan, I strongly encourage you to read it. The mandatory pro bono referendum is the only chance that students will have to express their views on this pernicious program.

The most offensive aspect of the ECIIP plan is its stated aim, "socialization," particularly of first year students. Harvard spends more money and devotes more effort to clinical and public interest programs than any other law school. (That's a fact). Here are some extracurricular opportunities for the public interest minded—The Public Interest Workshop and the World of Law speaker series; clinical programs such as the Legal Aid Bureau and the Legal Services Center; groups such as the Human Rights Program, the upcoming Criminal Justice Center, the Center for Criminal Justice, and the Program on Negotiation. On top of that are the many journals and student organizations. Is Harvard a great place or what? The authors of the ECIIP plan concede as much and write that "We find it amazing that despite the fact that HLS provides significant avenues for expression of interest in public service, so few students go into the public interest sector upon graduation. The only possible conclusion is that...we must do even more." The "more" they propose consists of carrot and stick. The carrot is: preferred admissions; non-need scholarships both before and after graduation; a new, lavish (no kidding) Public Interest Law Center; and a more generous, tuition-funded

LIPP program. The stick is mandatory first year socialization courses and 100 hours of conscript labor.

In truth, many students are already over-committed to extra-curricular activities. Many students would currently fulfill a 100 hour pro bono requirement if "pro bono" were defined broadly. ECIIP has hinted that work for student organizations might be credited to the pro bono requirement. Don't believe it. Schools that have adopted pro bono requirements, and that ECIIP proposes as models for HLS, do not credit work for student organizations. However, students taking clinical programs would not be burdened—their pro bono requirement would be satisfied. This program will punish in particular the morally deficient student who has invested his or her time elsewhere, such as in raising children, non-legal volunteer work, religious charities/activities or simple old-fashioned scholarship.

One of the basic principles of the democratic process is that those making the law will be governed by the law. ECIIP has enticed students to vote for mandatory pro bono on the basis that it "should" not apply to them. This is axiomatically irresponsible. If the requirement is instituted, those voting for it should be subject to it. I've got an idea. Let's have annual elections in which 1Ls vote as to whether the requirement will apply to them in their second and third years. I've got a better idea. Let's make pro bono voluntary.

ECIIP has backpedaled recently, telling students that a vote for mandatory pro bono is in reality just a statement of support for public interest, "just like the petition." Is that what they will say after the vote? ECIIP lobbyists have already told the faculty that students want mandatory pro bono—will they now explain to the faculty that a YES vote for mandatory pro bono meant simply a warm feeling toward public interest? If the student body approves this referendum, we are likely to get mandatory pro bono. The other prongs of the ECIIP white paper are expensive and time-consuming to implement. In contrast, it is an easy compromise for the administration to require students to submit annually an affidavit to the effect that they have completed their 50 hours of service. Mandatory pro bono can be in place by September for returning 2Ls and 3Ls.

Black's Law Dictionary gives the literal meaning of pro bono as "for the good." ECIIP's definition of pro bono is, in reductio, "work that isn't paid." Voluntary work that isn't paid often times is for the good. Mandatory work that isn't paid is always a moral affront. Vote NO on mandatory pro bono

Ronald K. Edquist

Letter To The Editor Hark Box Letter Misrepresents

To the Editor,

Last week students received a letter in their Hark boxes from three first year students lambasting the idea of a public service requirement at Harvard Law School. The letter was a thinly disguised effort to get students to vote against the proposed requirement in the LSC referendum to be held this week. Regardless of the outcome of the referendum, the letter was completely off the mark and the record should be set straight.

First, they attribute entirely too much power to ECIIP and the force of "special interest politics," as they call it. The purpose of the referendum is to gauge student support for the idea of a public service requirement—it is the faculty, not ECIIP or any other student group, who will ultimately make the decision about whether such a program will be instituted, and if so, what form it will take and what type of service will qualify. In the letter these students claim:

"ECIIP can tell us that 'pro bono/public service' work includes the NRA, the John Birch Society, and the Right-to-Life Movement but we are skeptical; we think if there was any prospect of HLS students flocking to organizations like those, ECIIP would withdraw its support in a hurry..." Once again, the issue is up to the faculty. It is not dependent on ECIIP's support. Furthermore, if, as the letter implies, there is no prospect that students will flock to work at such organizations even if such work would fulfill the requirement, then it is the students themselves that have made any political or partisan decision involved. If the type of work that would satisfy the requirement is broadly defined, then any political bent in the program for any individual student would be determined by that student himself or herself.

Second, these three students state that "[t]he Harvard Law School envi-

Continued on page 11

Pro Bono Critics Are Illogical

Continued from page 4

why not even a course called Legal Reasoning that draws materials from a variety of substantive disciplines?

The point is not that Harvard's current requirements are arbitrary or worthless. The point is that important policy choices underlie curricular requirements and to assert otherwise is to deny plain fact and prevent meaningful discussion. Even the decision to allow fulfillment of the professional responsibility requirement as late as the third year, rather than requiring it in the first and second, represents a policy choice that should not lightly be dismissed. Once this is acknowledged, the real debate can begin over the educational relevance and value of public service work, and arguments about morality, be they deontological or utilitarian, can be transcended along with reciprocal accusations of indoctrination and value imposition.

Opponents of "coercion" and "involuntary servitude" can be similarly easily

disposed of. Harvard already sets a host of course and credit requirements; even class attendance can be compelled. How our champions of individual liberty make a principled distinction between going to a classroom in Pound Hall and going to an office in Jamaica Plains, or writing a brief for a real client instead of a fictitious one, is beyond me.

Let us then discard these availing threshold arguments about necessity and fairness and move on to discuss the proposal on its merits. That four law schools already require some public service work before graduation should in itself be sufficient to show that the idea behind the current proposal deserves serious consideration. Particular components of the proposal as a whole may very well be voted down by a majority of our student body. But let them be so voted after reasoned debate rather than thoughtless rejection.

—Sadiq Reza, 2L

THE REFERENDUM: Disbanding Law School Council

Disbanding Law School Council: An Ineffective Organization Unfair To Future Students

For all the criticism directed against it, the Law School Council has performed a valuable service to the law school community over the years. Recently, LSC has initiated the Somerville shuttle service, formulated a proposal

**Michael Wayne
Opponent**

for Fly-Out Week that is still being perfected, made suggestions for expanding and improving the curriculum and feedback at the law school, spoken out against the tuition increase, and generally provided a forum for the discussion of issues of concern to students. Moreover, LSC assures student representation on virtually every aspect of law school life. In a school already short on bridges to tie the school's individuals and organizations together, it would be shortsighted to abolish the one representative organization devoted to building a sense of community.

The effectiveness of any student government is a function of the people who are elected, the issues it has to deal with, and the concern and commitment of those it represents. While not everyone may be satisfied with the results of the preceding LSC administration, it would be unfair and unwise to prejudge the present candidates as well as future HLS students. Disappointment with the substance of one or another decision — and every democratic decision leaves some disappointed — does not lead to the conclu-

sion that a representative student government should be abolished.

LSC has been a voice for students and a forum, open to all students, where issues can be discussed fairly and thoroughly by a group of people who have volunteered a considerable amount of their time to serve the community. Were the council abolished, students would still need to deliberate publicly about issues of common concern, and a new forum would have to be created to serve that function. Moreover, the section representatives, especially in the first year, perform some important duties in administering the section's academic and social activities. Here again, the need would persist and necessarily be filled by another representative structure. In short, though the referendum is not binding, even if the council were somehow to disappear, the need would call a similar organization back into existence. It is counter to our own interests as students to disband the only representative organization we have, especially when there are so many urgent issues confronting the new administration at the law school.

The officers being chosen today have demonstrated their commitment to the students and the school. They deserve a chance to prove that student government can be effective in meeting the needs of the community and improving the quality of life and education at the law school.

—Michael Wynne, IL

Letter To The Editor

Editorial Mistakes On LSC

To the editor:

Your editorial in the March 16, 1990, issue is factually misleading, politically naive and journalistically irresponsible.

It was never the objective of the Student Dean Search Committee to endorse or hamper any particular person's candidacy for deanship. Its objectives were to collect and channel student concerns through the student-body-wide questionnaire, to ensure that such concerns were reflected in the dean selection process, and to provide the new dean with clearly articulated students' concerns. Both the Student and the Faculty Dean Search Committees understood that President Bok had the ultimate power to select whomever he saw fit, regardless of what the Faculty or Student Dean Search Committee might have said. But our goal was to make sure that there was a pluralistic voice that reflected students' particular perspectives and concerns. However much weight President Bok chose to assign to our questionnaire results, and however he balanced them with interests of the Faculty or alumni were not within our determination.

By the same token, the new dean may choose to answer any or none of the articulated student concerns when balancing with other interests. Our work focused on securing the voice of students in the selection process. It is false that the Student Committee "never even suspected" Dean Clark's candidacy—it was just irrelevant to our task at hand. The Editor's apparent dismay over Dean Clark's selection points nothing to any "failure" on the part of the Faculty or Student Dean Search Committees. If anything, this LSC creation for the first time secured a pluralistic students' voice in the dean selection process. The voice might not be clearly audible as yet, but as JFK urged in his inaugural address: the task may not be completed in four years or in this decade, but let us begin. And LSC should be commended for its vision, its courage, its efforts and its achievement.

I do not think the Administration

actually chose to do nothing to Baker & McKenzie because of LSC's efforts. BLSA's position was enhanced, not thwarted, by LSC participation. Mainstream and radical politics should be complementary, not antagonistic. Of course politics that follow institutional routes dissipate and constrain political energies, but it can also give structure and at times the necessary legitimacy to these energies. On the other hand, institutional politics can easily be so sterilizing that we do need radical elements in the movement. The task is to put them into a complementary mode rather than slaughtering mainstream politics. Both Martin Luther King, Jr. and Malcolm X contributed much to the Civil Rights Movement, irrespective of what political route each chose. Radical politics offers a clear-cut "drama" with beginning, middle and end that mundane institutional politics does not. And maybe that aesthetic deficiency brings apathy to even national politics in this country. From a pragmatic viewpoint, however, LSC definitely has a unique position to play within the institutional structure that can enhance student interests.

Finally, I have never encountered a student body president who tried as hard as Brian Melendez to enhance the interests of the student body instead of keeping the job safe and comfortable by only organizing non-controversial parties. I do not agree with him on every issue, but I respect him for his dedication, good-will and efforts. LSC has come a long way since my 1L year in getting involved in student affairs that matter. Whether you like the results of the LSC's work and the positions it takes, it is irresponsible to print such a sweeping criticism without criticizing the general apathy of the HLS student body. LSC as a representative organization is nowhere near perfect, but it has been trying and gaining ground. It is much easier to be critical than to be correct, and a criticism should come through both the heart and the brain before it comes through the mouth.

—Maurice Hoo, 3L

This Wednesday and Thursday you will have the opportunity to cast your vote for the following resolution on your LSC ballot: "Resolved: That the Law School Council should be disbanded." With your vote, you can tell LSC what

**Robert K. Niewyk
Proponent**

has become clear from LSC's recent actions: LSC is ineffective and unrepresentative of students at this school.

LSC has no more legitimacy as the voice of the entire student body than any other group on campus. LSC was not organized or appointed by the administration; nor was it created with widespread student support. Only six years ago, a small group of students simply organized itself and declared that it would represent all law school students.

Of course, the members are now duly "elected" by the student body. However, the vast majority of LSC members are elected in name only. Students are so apathetic towards LSC that only a small fraction of the student body bothers to vote in a typical LSC election. Even worse, most LSC candidates are the only ones to run for their respective positions. We all know of the imperfections of democracy in even the most highly competitive representative organizations, where elections are hotly contested by several candidates and where a large percentage of the voters care about the candidates and where a large percentage of the voters care about the candidates and issues. In LSC elections, no one cares, and no one runs; those few who do run are more or less self-selected, self-appointed spokespersons for the student body. Recent graduates of the law school with whom I have spoken remember LSC as a marginal group with no legitimacy and no power, a group to whom no one listened. These graduates were surprised to hear that students entering the law school today assume that LSC is an authoritative or effective organization. There is even a difference between the perception of 3Ls, who have experienced several years of LSC's exploits, and 1Ls, who have only this past year to judge.

LSC's activities of the last year should be enough to reveal its flaws. Erick Hachenburg's recent editorial on these pages calling for the disbanding of LSC outlined three of LSC's "accomplishments":

—The dean search committee, to which LSC appointed two of its own members, two members of a special interest group (the Coalition for Diversity), and three students chosen by lottery. A huge battle ensued between student groups over the committee makeup, and the committee actually hurt the selection process; the committee was ignored by decision makers, and other student groups wasted their energy fighting over the committee itself.

—The debate over a Baker & McKenzie ban. LSC took over the position of the Black Law Students Association, was ignored by the administration as LSC became mired in its own debates and bureaucratic procedures, then sat on its hands as BLSA took up the ball and protested the administration's decision. If anything, LSC detracted from BLSA's position by allowing the administration to pretend to deal with LSC and ignore other groups.

—The public interest debate. LSC adopted the position of ECPIC wholesale and announced that this was the position of the entire student body, sending the White Paper along to the administration without a student vote. (LSC is graciously allowing us to vote on a single proposal in the package, the mandatory pro bono requirement—but that's another column). As Mr. Hachenburg noted, LSC has no idea of how many students support the proposals.

Four other episodes should be noted. First, LSC last spring made a naked power grab by more or less attempting to take over the Dormitory and Student Affairs Council. LSC proposed a three-person committee made up of the presi-

dent of LSC, the president of DSAC, and the head of the ABA/LSD—with LSC's president as the head of the new committee, of course. LSC took this proposal to the administration before it ever showed it to the other student organizations. DSAC is responsible for student life in the dorms and on campus in general. It is understandable why LSC would attempt to usurp this function by attempting to take over DSAC and why LSC occasionally sponsor its own campus social events, an activity clearly within DSAC's realm: This would give LSC some legitimate responsibility and a concrete mission, something which it currently lacks.

Second, this past fall LSC presented a well-intentioned but hopelessly naive fly-out week proposal to the administration (did LSC really think the administration would simply cut a week of class time out of the schedule?). The administration, in typical fashion, used the LSC proposal as an excuse to do exactly what it had wanted to do anyway, adding the fly-out week and taking the missed days out of our vacation time and reading periods, all the while disregarding LSC's protests. This whole fiasco revealed the utter lack of respect LSC garners from the administration.

Third, LSC has put on the ballot a resolution sponsored by the Lawyer's Guild which is in effect an up or down vote on the decisions of the Supreme Court. What will a student vote either for or against this resolution accomplish? Is this within the function of LSC? We may as well have a vote on the following: "Resolved: That when a tree falls in forest and no one is around, the tree makes a noise."

Finally, LSC has sent a resolution to the administration which is nominally a protest against the proposed tuition hike. However, the paper spends exactly six sentences discussing tuition before it launches into a fifteen-point attack on the law school as a whole. The paper cites the "daily abuse" the faculty heaps on students, noting the faculty's "verbal attacks, snide comments," "boring, uninspired lectures, and time-fillers of all sorts." The paper also announces that "the delay in receiving grades is another kind of abuse the faculty inflicts on students" and that the graduate complex is "a permanent monument to the insensitivity of the administration toward the student body." Does even a significant minority of students at this law school feel this spiteful towards the faculty and administration?

In general, LSC is far too willing to adopt the positions of special interest groups and push them as the position of the entire student body. Both the supporters and the opponents of these positions are ill-served by LSC—opponents because their views are most decidedly not being represented, and supporters because their own groups' efforts; LSC is ineffective, and it gives the administration an easy way to pretend to listen to students while it ignores the message being conveyed. Finally, LSC deals with issues that it simply shouldn't be dealing with.

When considering whether to sign a petition to get the disbanding resolution on the ballot, several individuals expressed concern that if LSC were disbanded, other students groups would not be able to receive their funding. These concerns are misinformed; the Student Funding Board is a wholly separate entity.

Other students expressed reservations that actually disbanding LSC would be too drastic a step. Make no mistake: I feel this school would be better off without the Law School Council. However, the resolution is non-binding. Even if a majority of students vote "yes," LSC can choose to ignore the vote. I would hope, though, that LSC would view a significant number of "yes" votes as a mandate to do some serious soul-searching. A vote for this resolution is your only chance to tell LSC to examine its mission and its methods. Send the message by voting "yes" on the disbanding resolution.

THE REFERENDUM: Abortion And Civil Rights

Seeking A Collective Voice

The U.S. Supreme Court's recent decisions on civil rights and on a woman's right to choose have had a dramatic effect on the enforcement of some of the most basic of human rights. On April 11 and 12, we as Harvard Law

John Bonifaz Opponent

students will have the opportunity to voice collectively our concern about these decisions. On those days, the Law School Council, in conjunction with its student government elections, will hold a vote on the following statement:

"Through its recent decisions, the U.S. Supreme Court has begun to turn back the clock on civil rights and on a woman's right to choose. These decisions have substantially weakened the protection of some of the most basic of human rights. As law students and as future members of the legal profession, we find these court ruling unacceptable. We implore the Supreme Court to protect and uphold the hard-won civil rights gained through the years of sacrifice and struggle. And to remedy the most recent decisions, we call upon Congress and the President to restore the protection of these rights. At a time when the rest of the world is recognizing people's human rights on an unprecedented scale, the United States of America can and should do no less."

The newly-formed Civil Rights Coalition is sponsoring this referendum with the support of all of the HLS organizations that we represent: La Alianza, Black Law Students Association, Asian-American Law Students Association, Committee on Gay and Lesbian Legal Issues, Native-American Law Students Association, the Board of the Women's Law Association, the Disabled Law Students Association, and the HLS chapter of the National Lawyer's Guild. We urge HLS students to vote yes on this referendum as a way of expressing our opposition to the Court's recent rulings and as a way of showing our support for congressional efforts aimed at reversing these rulings.

The following is a brief summary of some of the Court's decisions last year which this referendum is designed to address:

- *Patterson v. McClean Credit Union*. In this case, the Court substantially weakened a section of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 (42 U.S.C. Sect. 1981) prohibiting racial discrimination in contracts. The Court greatly limited the use of this statute — right to a jury trial — by holding that it only protected against discrimination in the initial making of contracts and in the enforcement of contracts in the courts. The Court, in a decision which has sparked grave concern in the national civil rights community, held that Section 1981 did not apply to on-the-job discrimination, thus ruling against Patterson who had alleged a pattern of racial harassment by her employer and discrimination in her employer's promotional practices. Since the Court's rulings, more than 90 civil rights lawsuits making claims under Section 1981 have been dis-

missed.

- *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Antonio*. This ruling, as the NAACP's Legal Department wrote in its analysis of the Court's civil rights decisions (entitled "Crisis in the Courts"—August 1989), puts "the whole burden of discrimination, no matter how stark the numerical disparity of the employer's workforce." The Court held that an employer in a Title VII case no longer had the obligation to prove its business necessity defense and, instead, it required that the plaintiff prove that an employer's selection procedure did not advance a legitimate business interest.

- *Martin v. Wilks*. In this case, the Court allowed for white firefighters to collaterally attack an eight-year-old consent decree providing for promotions for African-Americans in the Birmingham, Alabama Fire Department. The Court made this ruling even though the white firefighters knew of the original lawsuit (filed by a class of African-American plaintiffs and the Justice Department) and did not intervene at that time. With this ruling dozens of such decrees across this country are now under threat of similar attacks.

- *City of Richmond v. Croson*. In this case, the Court declared that the City of Richmond's minority set-aside programs violated the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment. As the NAACP Legal Department writes: "The net impact of the *City of Richmond v. Croson* decision is to undermine the foundation of minority set-asides and all other forms of affirmative action at the local and state government level."

- *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services*. In this case, the Court weakened the protection of a woman's right to choose whether or not to have an abortion. Several states have already attempted to restrict this right as a result of the *Webster* decision.

The Court has also, in recent history, weakened the protection of the rights of gay and lesbian people, most notably through its 1986 decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick* in which it upheld a Georgia statute criminalizing sodomy. And on February 26 of this year, the Court refused to hear two cases challenging the U.S. Army and Navy ban on gays and lesbians.

There is today a crisis in the Supreme Court, and, in this time of crisis, we cannot afford to remain silent. The national civil rights community, together with Senator Edward Kennedy and other members of Congress, has already put forth legislation aimed at reversing the *Patterson*, *Wards Cove*, and *Martin* decisions (Civil Rights Act of 1990—Senate bill 2104). With an affirmative vote on April 11 and 12, we can add our support to this legislation and to future congressional efforts addressing the Court's recent rulings. With an affirmative vote, we can join the rising tide of voices in this country against the Court's attack on the protection of people's rights. And with an affirmative vote, we can come together as law students, accepting our responsibility to speak out and recognizing the strength of a people united.

Keep Mind Open On Public Service

To the editor:

I'm in favor of the public service referendum, on the grounds that, if the referendum passes, it would open up a dialogue with the faculty and administration about whether a public service requirement is a good thing and would signal continuing student support for public interest and public service issues. Does that mean I am a radical? I don't think so; at least no one's ever suggested that to me before.

I think it means, to the contrary, that the misguided and confusing attacks

on the public service requirement must be coming from students with a vested interest in seeing everything even remotely related to public interest or public service fail. Some students have seemingly lost any objectivity they may have possessed and are letting their politics not just color, but actually dictate, their analysis.

I hope fellow students think hard about the limited but important goals of the public service referendum — then support it.

—Ted Bilich, 3L

How High Will Harvard Jump?

In asking the students of Harvard Law School to vote a simple "yes" or "no" on whether the Supreme Court, by its recent decisions in the areas of civil rights and abortion, has "substantially weakened protection of some of the

Chris Crain Opponent

most basic human rights," the local chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild may very well document for the first time what some of us have long suspected: when a liberal says "jump," Harvard Law School only asks, "how high?"

The United States Supreme Court has issued hundreds of opinions over the last year, dozens in the areas of civil rights and abortion; all addressing complex issues of statutory and constitutional interpretation; all implicating procedural issues of stare decisis, standing, etc; some written by Reagan appointees and some written by the more liberal justices and some joined by groups of some or all of both political camps.

And yet those proposing this student "poll" would have us throw complexity into the wind and pass judgment on the Court's handling of this whole range of legal, ethical, and social issues. In doing so, the National Lawyers' Guild poll may not successfully determine whether the Supreme Court has in fact "turned the clock back" on civil rights. But it will quite accurately find out how knee-jerk Harvard law students can be when asked.

We're not even done: the favor of specifying what particular Supreme Court opinions the poll is meant to address. On second thought, it might have been dangerous for those sponsoring the poll to list actual decisions, risking that students might recognize one or two opinions they do not consider destructive of individual rights.

As much as we might hate allowing complicated facts to interfere with a perfectly good opportunity to prove our political correctness, at least a cursory glance of what the Supreme Court has actually done might be justified.

In *Patterson v. McClean Credit Union*, the Supreme Court upheld its expansive opinion in *Runyon v. McCrary* that section 1981's prohibition against racial discrimination in the making and enforcement of contracts applies to private contracts as well.

YES? or NO?

In *Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins*, the Court ruled that when a Title VII plaintiff proves her gender played a part in an employment decision, the burden shifts to the defendant to prove it would have made the same decision regardless of gender.

YES? or NO?

In *Martin v. Wilks*, the Court held that an individual has the right to challenge a consent decree entered in a previous lawsuit that adversely affects his or her employment solely on the basis of race.

YES? or NO?

In *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, the Court held that a city must have evidence of previous discrimination against minority contractors before it can set aside contracts based upon the race of those bidding for it.

YES? or NO?

In *Wards Cove Packing Co. v. Antonio*, the Court held that in order to establish a prima facie case, a Title VII plaintiff must offer statistics demonstrating that the racial composition of an employer's labor force does not conform with that of the relevant labor force, and link that disparity with specific discriminatory practices of the employer.

YES? or NO?

The poll also covers the area of "a woman's right to choose," presumably meaning the area of abortion rights. Perhaps that unpleasant word, abortion, was left out because it too easily suggests a debate with more than one dimension, and not so conducive to a "yes" or "no" vote.

In *Webster v. Reproductive Health Service*, the Court rejected a challenge by the state of Missouri and the United States government to overturn its previous decision in *Roe v. Wade*. A plurality of the Court abandoned *Roe*'s problematic trimester scheme and indicated it would allow state legislatures to balance for themselves the state's interest in protecting a woman's right to terminate her pregnancy with the state's interest to protect a fetus' right to survival, subject to judicial review.

YES? or NO?

These and other recent Supreme Court decisions have been the source of intense debate and controversy at Harvard Law School and elsewhere. Most individuals, when confronted one-on-one, admit to misgivings with some and agreement with others, as has always been and always will be the case with such controversial issues that affect everyone's civil rights, not just those of minorities and women.

It is an insult to our intelligence to suggest that the student body of Harvard Law School could vote a blanket "yes" or "no" on the Supreme Court's handling of so many issues, each affected by the facts of the individual cases in which they arose. The fact that all too many of us will likely jump because a liberal organization yelled "frog" only demonstrates just how knee-jerk our discussion of important legal issues has become.

Pro Bono: Reasonable Plan

Continued from page 4

Please don't be fooled by the insinuation that a pro bono requirement would take 100 hours of your time per year. That is simply ludicrous. Nationally, the highest student pro bono requirement is currently 35 hours for each of the last two years of law school. The White Paper recommended a ceiling of 100 hours over the last two years, or 50 hours per year. It also recommended that pro bono work done in the summer (in addition to the primary employment) count toward the requirement. It is hard to imagine HLS feasibly requiring more work than that. They will probably require much less.

The pro bono initiative on the ballot this week is not radical. It is a rational measure to improve the educational standards at HLS. It is also quite innocuous in that it does not limit students in the type of pro bono work they can do.

We urge you to vote YES on the pro

bono initiative this week. Realizing that this requirement, if passed, unfortunately will affect only future students, we also encourage you take the initiative to do pro bono work yourself before you leave HLS. Donate time on your own or take a clinical class before you graduate (registration for clinicals is Monday and Tuesday this week).

—Clay Deanhardt, 1L
—Cynthia Sadkin, 1L
—Clarissa Klug, 1L
—Natalie M. Duval, 1L
—Marie Milnes, 1L
—Joan Pepin, 1L
—Wayne Scheeler, 1L
—Curtis Payne, 1L
—Moanica Caston, 2L
—Lisa R Hodges, 2L
—Julie Hutcheson, 1L
—Jonathan Harwitz, 1L
—Joe Metcalf, 1L
—Linda Singer, 2L
—Julie L. Ferguson, 2L

THE ONLY CHOICE!

BAR/BRI Prepares More Graduating Law Students
for the N.Y., N.J., MA., CT., N.H., VT., ME., and R.I.
Bar Exams Each Year Than All Other Courses Combined!

There must be a reason why.

YES NO

Does BAR/BRI have the finest bar review outlines to use while in law school as well as for bar preparation?

☒	☐
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Does BAR/BRI have the most qualified faculty teaching its review course?

☒	☐
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Does BAR/BRI have a full-time attorney staff to give each student personal assistance in using the BAR/BRI material and method?

☒	☐
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Does BAR/BRI grade more individual essays for its students than any other course?

☒	☐
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Does BAR/BRI offer its course in more locations than any other course?

☒	☐
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Compare BAR/BRI vs. The Competition!

barbri
BAR REVIEW

THE ONLY CHOICE!

Northeast Office:
BAR/BRI
415 Seventh Avenue—Suite 62
New York, N.Y. 10001
(212) 594-3696

New England Office:
BAR/BRI
160 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, Mass. 02116
(617) 437-1171

Connecticut Office:
BAR/BRI
880 Asylum Avenue
Hartford, Conn. 06105
(203) 724-3910

Now There's A Choice!

Take PMBR for California or the MBE



*The Nation's Leading
Multistate Expert!*

★ Nationally Renowned Multistate Lecturers

★ Specialized Multistate Workshops

★ 2,000 Simulated MBE Questions

★ 30% ABA/LSD Discount

★ "Fully Integrated" Program

★ "Structured Learning System"

★ Essay/Performance Workshops

★ Expert California Law Professors

★ Simulated California Bar Examination



The Complete California Course!

CALIFORNIA HEADQUARTERS: 1247 6th Street, Santa Monica, California 90401

(213) 459-8481 • (800) 523-0777

Letters To The Editor

Meet The Pro Bono Challenge

Fellow Students:

On Wednesday and Thursday of the week we will have the opportunity to vote for or against the idea of a public service requirement at HLS. You may recall having received a letter in your Hark Box last week written by some classmates expressing their concern at the prospect of a public service program being implemented here at Harvard.

I agree with the writers of that letter that the prospect of a public service program here at Harvard is controversial. And I believe, with them, that implementing such a program at HLS would not be without its problems. In deciding whether to support the public service program, however, I also believe that it is too important a decision to be treated as histrionically as these students have done in their letter.

What is controversial about incorporating a public service program in our curriculum is neither how to define public service nor whether to mandate it, but instead how to implement it. I don't believe for a minute that Dean Clark, the faculty, the law school council, or anybody else here at Harvard would require you to work for the ACLU any more than I believe that they would require you to work for the Heritage Foundation. I also doubt that, were a public service program implemented at Harvard, you would be prevented from serving the public through either of these organizations or through any number of other publicly-oriented organizations, whether implicated in politics or not.

Pro bono—a substitute term for public service—is short-hand for the latin *pro bono publico*, which means "for the public good." Working for either of these organizations, each of which encourages and participates in robust public debate, is certainly for the public good.

To suggest otherwise is to challenge the basis of participatory democracy in America. I doubt very much that the faculty of Harvard Law School, whose approval implementation of a public service program would require, is about to favor one political perspective over another as cavalierly as the writers of last week's letter would have us believe.

Moreover, not just reason but practicality dictates that Harvard, should it implement public service, will need to do so with an inclusive definition of what constitutes public service. Setting aside for a moment the presence of students at four other sizeable law schools nearby, public service at Harvard will mean the unleashing of more than 1100 students a year on the Boston area legal community. With so many students to place, Harvard simply cannot afford to constrict its definition of what qualifies as public service.

The letter circulated last week expressed dismay also at the prospect of HLS making public service a requirement. Perhaps those letter-writers do not realize what I, too, did not realize when I was a 1L—that the A.B.A. Model Rules of Professional Conduct and Model Code of Professional Responsibility mandate that it is a lawyer's continuing ethical obligation to render public interest legal service. The justification for a public service requirement in law school proceeds from what Professor Howar Lesnick, who proposed the program in place at U. Penn., identifies as a dual premise: "that a responsible practitioner devotes a portion of his or her work time to public service activities [and] that the experience of doing that as part of a student's legal studies can aid greatly in developing students' ability and willingness to act in a professionally responsible manner during their legal career." First-year courses, which deal directly with com-

Public Service Plan Misunderstood

Continued from page 6

ronment offers us a wide range of opportunities...we can make our own choices. We don't need ECPIP forcibly 'enhancing' our ethical and professional development, and we certainly don't want their vision substituted for our own, even for 100 hours." 1) *Our own??* The Law School Council isn't adequately representing the interests of the mass of students but three first-year students are? 2) *100 hours?* Where did that number come from? I don't think that any specific number of hours for a requirement at Harvard was even suggested. The program at Penn requires 35 hours per year and only during the last two years when students have few other requirements. 3) Regarding our ability to make our own choices and this ideal freedom they envision for the students at Harvard Law School—well, my guess is that most students don't float through the Law School and into the legal profession making choices all that freely. Harvard Law School saddles most students with staggering debt that drastically reduces the choices

many feel are open to them. Harvard Law School also plays a role in guiding the choices that students make, for example in "strongly recommending" a course in corporations yet neglecting to strongly recommend a course in some area such as poverty law that would expose students to problems facing a vast percentage of the nation's population—a law school course being the only formal exposure to these issues that many students will ever get.

Jim Wilon, Sean Carter, and Glen Miller explain that they "find it amazing that ECPIP has so little faith in the persuasive power of its ideology that it feels it must impose its priorities on future Harvard Law School students." Well apparently these three have so little faith in the persuasive power of their own opposition to a public service requirement that they have to completely misrepresent the whole proposition to the entire student body. Actually, I don't find *that* very amazing at all.

—Cathy Bendor, 1L

petence, are made mandatory; public service should be likewise. Public service, after all, is a component of professional responsibility, and professional responsibility bears directly on a lawyer's competence.

The controversy over public service cannot be resolved as easily as this, however, for it is not the *desirability* of a meaningful public service program that is controversial, but rather its *feasibility*. As I mentioned above, public service at Harvard will mean unleashing more than 1100 law students on the Boston area legal community. 1100 law students require 1100 supervisors and 1100 meaningful placements. Identifying those supervisors, rendering meaningful the placements and coordinating the whole shebang

will be a Herculean task. Attempting that task will be worthwhile if the student experiences which result are meaningful, but it will be wasted, or worse, if our experiences ring hollow.

The real challenge of public service, then, is its implementation. Public service is a bold and innovative new idea in legal education. It is an idea with profound merit—but only if it can be made to work. So let us dispense with hysterical claims that obscure the real challenge and instead pool our creativity to meet that challenge. I applaud a robust public service debate. Why not strive to make that debate *pro bono pro bono publico*?

—David Zubkoff, 3L

PIEPER NEW YORK — MULTISTATE BAR REVIEW, LTD.

90 Willis Avenue, Mineola, New York 11501

Telephone: (516) 747-4311

The Bar Course That Cares.

Clark And Students Square Off Again

Continued from page 1

been made on the faculty diversity issue since 1970, when the law school started admitting minorities in more than token numbers.

"For two decades Hispanic students have been meeting with deans and for two decades we have seen almost no action," said Jorge Ramirez, a member of La Alianza and the Law Review. "I am emotional about this, and I make no apologies for it."

On Monday morning Clark sent a letter to the Coalition for Civil Rights in which he said, "I share your beliefs about the importance of diversity at the Law School . . . [but] I do not condone the use of sit-ins that have the effect of disrupting normal Law School operations and intimidating Law School personnel."

Clark said the school has made "important strides" on the issue of faculty diversity in recent years. He said of 11 offers for visiting professorships next year, seven were made to women and two were made to minorities.

Such claims did not placate the protestors, who often point out that visiting professors who are women or minorities are almost never offered tenure. Research by the Women's Law Association indicated that 15 of the last 16 women who visited at Harvard are now teaching at other prestige law schools.

The protestors also point out that Harvard still has no tenured or tenure-track professors who are Latino, Asian-American, Native American, disabled,

or openly gay or lesbian.

Clark and the Coalition agreed to have an open meeting on the issue of diversity Friday at 1 p.m. All students and faculty are to be invited.

After the Monday rally but before the sit-in in Griswold the students marched into Pound Hall, where dozens of new admits were lunching with professors in the second-floor dining room. As the chanting outside the room of "where the hell is Dean Clark" reached a crescendo, Clark suddenly appeared and walked hurriedly through the crowd with his fingers in his ears.

The crowd, still chanting pro-diversity slogans, followed Clark out of the building as he walked to his office. The dean put his hands over his face when a photographer tried to snap photos.

The wave of protest began last Thursday with a national law student strike for diversity and have since reached proportions not contemplated by the organizers, who never planned either sit-in. Nevertheless, there was a feeling of euphoria that the sit-in was sustained Thursday and students returned on Monday.

The group participating in Monday's sit-in included 26 people who did take part in Thursday's sit-in, although at least a dozen students who took part Thursday did not return on Monday. The group also include on admit.

"We never expected this to happen," said Lisa Hodges, 2L, the moderator of discussions during the first sit-in. "Then again, we never contemplated the dean would take such a hardline attitude."

Propelled by a series of energetic speeches on Thursday, about 100 students marched from the rally to Massachusetts Ave., then through Langdell Hall, to the faculty dining room in Pound Hall, and finally to the dean's office. Students entertained themselves with live music and chants of "diversity, now" and "where the hell is Dean Clark?"

Clark returned to his office in early afternoon and seemed taken aback to see students packed in his outer office. Students rejected his offer to meet in the Hark, and a decision was made to remain overnight when Clark left at 4:30.

Plainclothes security guards secured the building, but allowed most students to enter and leave.

As of late Monday night, students felt that two sit-ins were

having a positive effect.

"When we went to Clark's office on Thursday there were 20 students and he would not talk to us," said Hoo. "Today there were three times as many students and he had to come out of the office and talk to us with three other professors."

Next

RECORD:

April 21

Legislative And Court Reform Needed In Family Law

Continued from page 1

relies on false notions of how these institutions operate," Judge Wald concluded. "Your job is to present the truth in front of judges and the public."

Many of the speakers emphasized the need for legislative reform and more expedient judicial procedures to address children's pressing needs. "The nature of children's rights is controversial because it challenges basic assumptions about familial roles," Shari Shink, Executive Director of the Children's Legal Clinic in Denver, Co., explained that it

is necessary to rethink these assumptions if the victims of domestic violence and abuse are to be saved. "We want to rely on the assumptions that parents love kids, judges know what they are doing, lawyer's are always prepared, and social services act in the child's best interest, but these assumptions are not always true." Like most of the speakers present, Shink condemned foster care systems that constantly uproot children, moving them every few months. Children's interests, it was agreed, must be made a national priority.

Judge Tom McDonald of the District Court of Louisville, Ky. reported that a significant number of the juvenile delinquency defendants that come before him are meeting him for the second time; their first time being some years earlier as victims of abuse or neglect. "The punishment of these kids must be tailored to the child and family's needs, not a 'just deserts' method of just locking them up or taking them away from their homes." McDonald acknowledged a general lack of experience among judges in devising a reformatory plan for

those once victims and stressed the need for better training of judges and attorneys.

Urging everyone to pressure their representatives to perform on behalf of these hidden victims, Buel ended her presentation with a reprimand for the apathy that has kept them hidden by quoting Dr. Martin Luther King's *Letters from a Birmingham Jail*: "We will have to repent in this generation not merely for the hateful words and actions of the bad people but for the appalling silence of the good people."

Welcome to New York,
John Harvard.

Have You Considered
Joining The Harvard Club
of New York City?



On Friday, April 20th, 1990, members of the Admissions Committee of the Harvard Club of New York City will be in Cambridge at (1) Harvard Faculty Club at 20 Quincy Street, 2nd Floor; (2) Baker House, 1st Floor Conference Room; and (3) Aldrich Hall, Room 21 between 10:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Graduates of the Class of 1990 will be proposed, seconded and interviewed in one step for membership in the Club. Requirements for supporting letters, etc., are waived for this event for 1990 graduates. Information about the Club will be available, and Committee Members will try to answer any questions you may have concerning membership.

The Harvard Club of New York City can be a most comfortable and convenient amenity that will make New York more enjoyable. It offers a central location in the Grand Central area, with spacious dining rooms, bedrooms, bar, lounge, library, and extensive sports facilities.

DATE: Friday, April 20, 1990

TIME: 10:00 am to 5:00 p.m. (No appointment necessary.)

PLACES: Baker House, 1st Floor Conference Room; Law School Harvard Faculty Club, 2nd Floor, 20 Quincy Street Aldrich Hall, Room 211; Business School

Any questions, please contact Margie Mizrahi or Carol Danko at telephone: (212) 840-660 Fax: (212) 827-1250.

Harvard Club of New York City

27 West 44th Street, New York, NY 10036 (212) 840-6600

OLD,
RARE, SCHOLARLY
AND OUT-OF-PRINT
BOOKS ON
LAW

- CONSTITUTIONAL LAW AND HISTORY
- INTERNATIONAL LAW
- LEGAL HISTORY (AMERICAN, ENGLISH, ROMAN)
- LEGAL BIOGRAPHIES
- JURISPRUDENCE
- TAX AND COMMERCIAL LAW
- ETC., ETC.

For those students
and others who desire
to know more about the law
than can be found
in a casebook,
a court opinion
a loose-leaf service,
or a form book.

Send \$1.00 for catalogue to:

Q.M. DABNEY & CO.
P.O. BOX 42026
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20015

Classified

HOUSE FOR SALE: Unusually charming country on beautiful river. Large living/dining room; modern kitchen; master bedroom with view of the river; guest suite with sitting room; separate guest house for year-round living; dock for fishing and canoeing. 14.5 acres for privacy; near Bangor, Maine, close to the University of Maine. Under \$300,000. Immediate Occupancy. Contact **Jeanne F. Begg, Begg, Inc., (202) 944-8400.**

Harvard Law Record (ISSN 0017-8101) is published bi-weekly during the school year. Harvard Law School Record Corporation, 23 Everett St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138-9984. Telephone (617) 495-4418. Subscription price: \$20.00 year mailed; \$30.00 year mailed outside U.S. Individual copies: 50 cents at the Law School, \$1.00 mailed. Second-class postage paid at Boston, Mass. and additional mailing offices.

Copyright 1990 by the Harvard Law School Record Corporation and by the contributors.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Harvard Law School Association, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

ALUMNI/AE ADDRESS CHANGES: Alumni/ae who receive the Record as a result of membership in the Harvard Law School Association should mail change-of-address information to the Harvard Law School Association, Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Each alumnus/a receiving a Record subscription through the Harvard Law School Assn. should be on notice that \$5.80 of H.L.S.A. annual dues are used to purchase the Record subscription he or she receives. Dues are paid at any time during the H.L.S.A. fiscal year that began in April 1, 1989 and ends in March 1990 will purchase a subscription that begins in September 1989 and expires in May 1990, and so on in following years.

return address:

HARVARD LAW SCHOOL
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL ASSOCIATION
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138-9984

SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE
PAID AT BOSTON, MA
AND ADDITIONAL OFFICES