

# EQUALIZER

SALT

Volume 1992, Issue 3

Society of American Law Teachers

August 1992

## **SALT to File Amicus Brief in Military Recruitment Case**

— Arthur S. Leonard  
*New York Law School*

The SALT Board of Governors voted on May 16 to undertake amicus curiae participation in *Lloyd v. Grella*, 580 N.Y.S.2d 988 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., Monroe County, 2/13/92), appeal pending, Appellate Division, 4th Department. The trial court ruled that New York State Education Law §2-a mandates that schools provide access to military recruiters. The statute in question provides on its face that schools which allow employers to recruit on campus must provide access to representatives of the armed forces "on the same basis" as afforded to other employers.

The city of Rochester, New York enacted an ordinance banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in employment, housing and public accommodations. Subsequently, the Rochester Board of Education approved a resolution denying access to high school placement offices to any employer who discriminates on any basis covered by state or local law, including the local sexual orientation provision. The resolution also specifically provides that as long as the Defense Department maintains its overt policy of anti-gay discrimination, Rochester high school students shall be advised of the discriminatory policy.

A few weeks after the policy was enacted, a parent brought suit on behalf of her son. She alleged that he was being deprived of informa

*Continued on page 5*

## **PRESIDENT'S COLUMN**

— Sylvia A. Law  
*New York University*

### **CUNY Accreditation**

On June 27 the ABA's Accreditation Committee voted to grant full accreditation to the law school of the City University of New York at Queens. CUNY – providing legal education in the service of human needs – has been a special friend of SALT since its inception in 1983. In 1985 SALT honored the school, and in 1987 our annual award recognized the good work and radiant spirit of Howard Lesnick, CUNY's founding academic dean. CUNY is on our top ten list of schools with the most SALT members.

The ABA accreditation team asked hard questions about bar passage, scholarship, placement and academic excellence. On all of these issues, CUNY law school passed with flying colors.

We congratulate all of our friends at CUNY – and the former members of the CUNY faculty who helped to make the school so special. We look forward to seeing how the CUNY experiment will grow now that the school has passed this important hurdle.

### **IOLTA In Distress**

There are many connections between SALT members and the various state Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts (IOLTA) programs. These programs, created in the 1980's, pool small short-term legal escrow accounts, which otherwise would not be placed in interest-bearing accounts, and use the interest to support legal services programs for the poor. In an era of shrinking federal support of legal services for

*Continued on page 6*



## REPORT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS' MEETING

— Joyce Saltalamachia  
New York Law School

The Annual Spring SALT Board of Governors' meeting, held on May 16, 1992 at NYU, provided a forum for a lively discussion on a wide variety of subjects. The 18 board members who were present, along with past president Howard Lesnick and past vice-president Derrick Bell, discussed SALT involvement in future projects, conferences, and meetings, as well as appropriate SALT responses to legal education issues.

---

*"... deeply disturbed by Harvard's  
hiring and tenuring decisions ..."*

---

By far the liveliest discussion was sparked by the Harvard Law Review "parody" of Mary Joe Frug. While all present were appalled by the cruelty of the "parody", several board members stated that they were more deeply disturbed by Harvard's hiring and tenuring decisions and its treatment of Derrick Bell and of the people they have not hired. The discussion focused on whether legal education in general leads to a dichotomy between intellect and emotion that teaches students to "decontextualize".

Several board members felt that the hostile climate at Harvard can be found, to some degree or another, at all law schools and that SALT should confront the question of where the line is to be drawn between the regulation of violence, hostility, and hate speech on the one hand and first amendment and academic freedom on the other hand. It was suggested that SALT appoint an ad hoc committee to use Harvard as a case study to develop a policy statement about where to draw the line, in the same way that SALT had written a statement about the meaning of *Bakke* for law schools several years ago. The statement would call on law schools to set the moral tone and ethical tone in legal education and emphasize the institution's responsibility. This ad hoc committee of Paulette Caldwell,

Arthur Leonard, Pat Cain and David Kairys will gather stories on hostile legal environments, look at institutional responses, and draft a policy statement. It was suggested that this policy statement will be the topic of the Cover study group at the 1993 AALS Annual Meeting (discussed more fully on page 4).

In addition to the ad hoc committee statement, board members felt the need to have a more immediate SALT response to the Harvard parody. Howard Lesnick and Sylvia Law volunteered to write an op ed piece for publication in *The New York Times*.

Other discussion topics on the agenda included the 1993 SALT Teaching Conference (discussed more fully on page 8) and SALT's continuing support of the Spring Cover Conference, for which we voted to allot \$6,000 this coming year. We also decided to strongly encourage law school deans to fund student attendance in order to promote geographic as well as other forms of diversity.

The Treasurer's report revealed that SALT continues to be solvent, although our treasury is down from last year because of the large number of overdue annual dues. One positive note on the dues scene is that the treasury has been enhanced by the sales of the book *Looking at Law Schools* (discussed more fully on page 10).

---

*"... large number of  
overdue annual dues ..."*

---

Other committees reporting at this meeting were the Awards and Annual Dinner Committee, the Committee on SALT Positions, and the Committee on SALT's Program at the Annual Meeting of the AALS.

Regarding the next Board of Governors meeting, it was decided to break with the tradition of alternating meetings on the East and the West coasts and to have a Mid-West meeting in Chicago in September (see announcement on page 11). At that time, the Awards Committee will announce the recipient of the 1993 SALT Teaching Award. ■



## THE LSAT: A Lesson In Political Correctness

— Leslie Espinoza  
Boston College

SALT sponsored a panel on political correctness at the annual meeting of the AALS last January. In my presentation, entitled "Political Correctness and Testing", I emphasized that political correctness has always existed and that the current ruckus has developed only because outsiders are redefining what is "politically correct." I used three actual questions from the LSAT to make my point.

Lizabeth Moody, President of the Law School Admission Services and Executive Director of the LSAC, contacted me some weeks after the talk and asked to see the questions. I sent her a copy of the questions. President Moody responded in a letter to SALT, expressing her concern that the questions were written and administered before the LSAC implemented its new sensitivity review. As such, they were "relatively old," she wrote.

---

*"... political correctness  
has always existed and ...  
the current ruckus has  
developed only because  
outsiders are redefining  
what is 'politically correct.'"*

---

It is extremely important that SALT panel presentations continue to be the impetus for discussions about gender and race bias in law school admissions. As law teachers, our legacy is our students. This article is a hope and an invitation to continue the discussion. The LSAC's efforts to address bias should be heralded. However, they should not blind us to the need to continue to analyze questions for the stories they tell.

The questions I used in my presentation were developed in the early 1980's and were

used through 1989. They were three of more than 100 questions I have found offensive and have been saving over the last eight years. The LSAC did have a sensitivity review process during the 1980's and began a new sensitivity review in 1989. Only four tests have been released since the new process has been in place. In these new tests, there are still questions and answer choices that trouble me. However, within this limited sample, I have not found the same kind of blatant bias which existed in previous tests. For this, I congratulate LSAC's new review process.

---

*"The bias I have found  
is much subtler.  
It is a thematic bias."*

---

The bias I have found is much subtler. It is a thematic bias. For example, in questions involving women or minorities, wrong answer choices are the ones I find more appealing because they take a position. The correct answers always seem to be the choice asking that you look at the world from the dominant culture's perspective. Whether the outrageous question or the dissonant answer is more destructively biased, I leave for further discussion in other fora.

My point in the talk was that there had always been political correctness. It just was not called that. The old political correctness silenced and excluded outsiders in society. It dictated what could be discussed and how it could be discussed. It was pervasive and powerful in its unquestioned acceptance. It is only now, in the critiquing by outsiders of the dominant society's control of our disclosure, that a new, nascent political correctness exists. I call this Positive PC. Positive PC is a recognition that there was always a PC; it was just that the old PC silenced those who had so little power that they could not even complain about it. And often could not even recognize that they had been silenced.

I have strong feelings about the politics and timing of the recent PC movement. The so-called "regime" of PC is being touted as ty-

*Continued on page 4*



Continued from page 3

rannical control over what can be said. In contrast, I find the substance of what is being called PC to be, on the whole, positive. PC is a misnomer for political inclusiveness. It is my hope that people, especially those with institutional power (like law professors), will exercise care in what they say and will demonstrate sensitivity to the whole of their audience.

---

*"PC is a misnomer for  
political inclusiveness."*

---

The old PC did, and does, more than silence. In the world of test taking, it can exclude, disrupt and distort. It can bias the entire enterprise. If law schools continue to use the LSAT as a prime admission criterion, it is our responsibility to work with the LSAC to make certain that the test minimizes bias.

I am working on an article about the LSAT that will be part of the inaugural issue of the American University Journal of Gender and the Law. New York's truth in testing law, which requires test question disclosures, is being challenged. I argue that disclosure of actual test questions is central to monitoring the tests. To understand the stories and potential bias in the narratives, we need the actual questions. While the LSAC is not a plaintiff in the case, it has not committed to continued disclosure of actual tests if the law is not upheld. Indeed, since the 1990 loss in the district court, the LSAC is releasing fewer actual test questions than before. I commend the LSAC for continuing to address bias internally, and I hope that it will act to enhance the free flow of information so that we can continue to discuss and analyze the LSAT. ■

## **HOSTILE LAW SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS:**

### **Defining Institutional Responsibility**

— SALT Committee on  
Hostile Environments

As a part of its ongoing commitment to diversity in legal education, SALT is turning its attention to the problem of defining the responsibility of law schools in situations involving hostile educational and workplace environments. We intend to prepare a statement emphasizing the responsibility of law schools to set proper moral and ethical standards for interactions within law school communities.

Many people report that incidents of violence directed at students and faculty in law schools are occurring with increasing frequency. This violence is directed disproportionately toward the victims of sexism, racism and heterosexism. It is imperative, therefore, in the interest of diversity, that law schools confront the question of defining the line between regulation of various forms of harassment on the one hand, and the preservation of first amendment values and academic freedom on the other. It is equally imperative that law schools develop creative, educationally and socially wise, means of addressing these conflicts.

---

*"... incidents of violence  
directed at students and faculty  
in law schools are occurring  
with increasing frequency."*

---

Our immediate concern is prompted not only by the publication by students at Harvard Law School last spring of a parody of slain Professor Mary Joe Frug's work in feminist theory, but also by the institutional response, or lack

Continued on page 9



*continued from page 1*

tion about military job opportunities in violation of Education Law §2-a. The School Board countered that the military was afforded access on "the same basis" as any other employer; if the Defense Department dropped its official discriminatory policy, it would be allowed to send representatives to recruit on Rochester high school campuses. Supreme Court Justice Francis A. Affronti ruled on February 13 that the statute mandates access for the military, regardless of the military's discriminatory policy. His decision was based primarily on "legislative history," consulted after Affronti found the statute's language raised "varying plausible interpretations." Affronti also found that the School Board resolution was aimed primarily at the military, focusing on the portion requiring schools to counsel students about the military's policy.

SALT's interest in the case is that §2-a, read in conjunction with §214, applies to all institutions that are part of the "University of the State of New York," a statutory term signifying all educational institutions chartered by the State of New York. Thus, more than a dozen law schools are affected, and many of them presently exclude military recruiters under policies adopted by their faculties and administrators. An AALS By-Law governing non-discrimination and

---

*" . . . more than a dozen law schools  
are affected, and many  
of them presently exclude  
military recruiters . . . "*

---

employer access to law school placement facilities requires AALS-member schools to maintain policies similar to that adopted by the Rochester School Board. (AALS declined to participate in the case at this level, but might get involved if it reaches a higher appellate level.)

Faculties at two New York law schools have recently been stymied in their attempts to comply with the AALS By-Law due to administrative interpretations of §2-a. The SUNY-Buffalo law faculty was overruled by central administrators of the State University, who asserted that local campuses could not exclude the military. A SUNY law student filed charges with the New York State Division of Human Rights, asserting a violation of Governor Mario Cuomo's Executive Order 28,

---

*" The SUNY-Buffalo law faculty  
was overruled . . . At Cornell  
Law School, the faculty's  
vote was countermanded . . . "*

---

which bans sexual orientation discrimination in services provided by state entities. An initial ruling in the student's favor was reversed by the Commissioner of Human Rights, whose decision is being challenged in a court proceeding launched by Lambda Legal Defense & Education Fund in July. At Cornell Law School, the faculty's vote was countermanded by the president of the university, relying on an opinion of the university's counsel that §2-a precluded Cornell from excluding military recruiters. Provisions similar to §2-a exist in some other states.

Deborah Batts, Mary Dale, James Kainen and Russell Pearce of Fordham University School of Law have volunteered to draft an amicus brief for SALT, arguing that the School Board's action is valid. They are being assisted by Fordham law student Fran Skoler, in consultation with SALT President Sylvia Law of New York University (who is drafting SALT's statement of interest) and me. I am also overseeing preparation of an amicus brief for the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. Other organizations preparing amicus briefs in support of the Rochester School Board include the New York Civil Liberties Union and the New York State School Boards Association.

As SALT members, your thoughts on these matters would be greatly appreciated. Please let us hear from you. ■



*continued from page 1*

the poor, IOLTA has become an essential source of funds for pro bono legal work. While harassing and debilitating restrictions increasingly are attached to federal legal services funds, IOLTA programs nurture and respect innovative work by lawyers who represent the poor. Some SALT members, including myself, serve on state boards that administer IOLTA funds. In addition, IOLTA provides funds for SALT members, particularly clinical teachers. Many law school public interest programs are funded by state IOLTA. Many of us work with organizations that look to IOLTA for essential support.

---

*"IOLTA today faces  
core challenges . . . "*

---

IOLTA today faces core challenges from two directions. First, public and private interest groups work to undermine and discredit the services that IOLTA provides for the poor. Conservative groups in California, Florida, Arkansas, Utah, New Hampshire and Iowa have filed suits arguing that the IOLTA program violates the fifth and fourteenth amendments by seizing private property. All of these claims have been rejected on grounds that the clients suffered no real economic loss as a consequence of the program. On April 22, 1991, the right-wing Washington Legal Foundation filed suit in Massachusetts claiming that IOLTA violated the first amendment rights of lawyers and clients by requiring them to support political causes with which they disagreed. The plaintiffs argued that litigation on behalf of the poor is inherently political. On May 28, the federal district court dismissed the claim and upheld the IOLTA program.

The second, more serious, challenge confronting IOLTA today is a sharp decrease in funds available to support services for the poor. These decreases result, in part, from falling bank interest rates and rising bank charges for processing the accounts. In addition, many

governors and state legislatures have sought to divert IOLTA funds to provide services that historically have been provided directly by the state, most notably criminal defense. IOLTA programs have been less successful in meeting these fiscal challenges. As a consequence, in most states the coming year will see significant reductions in state financial support for pro bono legal work.

**Revisions To  
Standards Of Professional  
Responsibility**

The ABA Standing Committee on Lawyers' Public Service Responsibility is seeking comments on proposed revisions to Model Rule 6.1 (Pro Bono Public Service) of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. The Committee plans to present amendments to Model Rule 6.1 to the ABA House of Delegates for adoption at the Midyear Meeting in February 1993.

The proposed rule would make many significant changes in lawyers' pro bono obligations. It quantifies the amount of pro bono work that a lawyer is expected to provide and sets a target of 50 hours per year. It emphasizes the provision of free legal services to persons of limited means. It prohibits lawyers from fulfilling their pro bono obligation

---

*"Should the profession expect  
that law professors devote  
at least 50 hours a year  
to pro bono work? "*

---

through financial contributions to organizations that provide legal services to persons unable to afford counsel. It specifies that failure to receive a billed fee does not constitute pro bono work. All of these changes move in the direction of giving substance and teeth to the ethical norm of Rule 6.1. On the other hand,



the proposed rule, like the existing one, explicitly rejects the notion that the rule may be enforced through the disciplinary process.

If you would like to present written comments on these changes, or to testify at hearings that the ABA is holding on them, please contact Beverly Groudine, Assistant Counsel, ABA, 541 N. Fairbanks Court, Chicago, Illinois 60611-3314, (312) 988-5771.

Should SALT, as an organization, take a position on these proposed changes? My sense is that most of our members would support the revisions that strengthen the definition of lawyers' pro bono obligations. I am less clear whether most SALT members would agree with me that the proposed changes are weakened, perhaps eviscerated, by the assurance that no concrete disciplinary consequence attach to an attorney's failure to meet the required pro bono standards. The new standards do not specifically address the situation of law professors. Should they? Should the profession expect that law professors devote at least 50 hours a year to pro bono work? Is teaching inherently pro bono on grounds that teachers tend to earn less than the highest paid lawyers? Or perhaps those teachers who train lawyers for pro bono work are exempt from direct service, while those who train lawyers to represent the well-to-do are not? We will take up these issues at the SALT Board meeting in September and would appreciate guidance from members who have thought about these questions. ■

**DUES . . .**

**PLEASE . . .**

**NOW**

*SALT Members, by now you  
have received your annual dues  
notice. Please, please respond ASAP.*

## **BLINDNESS BRED BY PRIVILEGE**

— Angela P. Harris  
*University of California at Berkeley*

Early in the morning of June 21, 1990, a group of teenage white boys living in St. Paul, Minnesota, are said to have taped broken chair legs together to form a crude cross, and then burned it on a black family's lawn. At least one of the boys, identified publicly only as R.A.V. because of his age, was later charged with, among other things, violating a recently-passed St. Paul ordinance. The ordinance prohibited the display of a symbol which one knows, or has reason to know, "arouses anger, alarm or resentment in others on the basis of race, color, creed, religion or gender."

---

*" . . . the Supreme Court . . .*

*opinion was doctrinally*

*muddled . . . "*

---

Last month, in *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul* (112 S.Ct. 2538 (1992)), the Supreme Court struck down that ordinance on first amendment grounds. Its opinion was doctrinally muddled, simultaneously accepting a limiting construction of the ordinance that restricted its application to "fighting words" and holding that the ordinance was impermissibly content-based because it singled out some kinds of fighting words but not others. But the outcome, like the conduct that preceded it, came as no surprise to anyone.

When I was asked to write about the connection between this decision and law school life, I was surprised by the difficulty of the assignment. It is not as though there is no hatred here. Any close examination of the walls of the nearest bathroom, carrel, or elevator will reveal all the familiar expressions of hate based on those familiar physiological and cultural traits that we as a nation have invested with metaphysical, almost mystical, significance. Indeed, it has become a truism on the left that racism, sexism, and their siblings are

*Continued on page 8*



Continued from page 7

everywhere in this society, a long, dark river winding through the heart of the culture from which we all get our drinking water.

I think the difficulty of the assignment was a measure of the depth of my privilege. You could name this privilege "class", although I think the label does not adequately convey the layers of cultural capital – education, institutional position, individual standing – that shield and insulate me. The fact is that law students and law professors, by and large, do not burn crosses on people's lawns. Particularly as professors, we are offered forms of social power so vast in comparison to R.A.V.'s power to shame and frighten one family that such a crude display is shocking, repellent, even incomprehensible.

---

*"... a long, dark river winding  
through the heart of the culture ..."*

---

Instead, we can draw from that long, cold river in ways that are barely perceptible even to ourselves. The law school examinations that Patricia Williams brings to light in her recent book, *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*, do a strange and subtle kind of violence to their victims. The constitutional law exam in which students must use the first amendment to defend a polemic called "How to Be a Jew-Nigger" is different from the burning cross made of broken chairs not only in the hearts of the victims but in the minds of the perpetrators. We can defend it in ringing first amendment tones of academic freedom and the need to toughen students up. We have grown so used to equating racism with conscious anger and resentment that we no longer notice that we live by, and on, the river.

Not that the two forms of violence are the same. The threat of physical harm is barely veiled in the case of the burning cross, nonexistent in the case of the constitutional law exam. Forced to choose between these two ordeals, I have no trouble deciding which one I

would undergo. But they are also linked.

Privilege means not only never having to use violence; it also means not always knowing violence when you see it. The forms of violence we resort to are so quiet and insidious as to often be unnoticeable. Even when they become visible, their perpetrators may react with startlement and wounded innocence that their acts are perceived as hateful; this is what seems to have happened with the Harvard authors of the "Post-Masculine Manifesto." [check this title!!] The hate crime legislation that punishes the cross-burners helps maintain the vast distance between a constitutional law professor and R.A.V. My friend Dwight Greene objects to hate crimes on this ground – because they single out the relatively powerless and in so doing further insulate the powerful.

Again, a cross burning is not a constitutional law exam. But our long distance from and easy answers to the R.A.V. case should not make us shut our eyes to the problem. We should take heart from St. Paul's earnest and clumsy effort to name it and set it out of bounds, whether "it" takes the form of a swastika or a song. ■

## **REIMAGINING TRADITIONAL LAW SCHOOL COURSES**

- Zipporah Wiseman  
University of Texas
- Anne Goldstein  
Western New England College

The 1993 SALT Teaching Conference, "Reimagining Traditional Law School Courses: Workshops Integrating Class, Gender, Race, Disability and Sexual Orientation Into Our Teaching and Course Materials," will take place at New York University School of Law during the spring of 1993.

The conference will provide an opportunity for experienced and new teachers of each subject to work together in small groups. These groups will work intensively on teaching and materials in their subject areas. The SALT conference will also attempt to explore ways of working with the intense emotional reactions often generated among our students and colleagues when diverse perspectives are integrated into traditional courses.



The following people have agreed to coordinate the planning for the indicated small subject groups:

*Clinical*

Randy Hertz (NYU)

*Criminal Law*

Angela Harris (Berkeley)

*Torts*

Okainer Dark (Richmond)

*Constitutional Law*

Ruth Ann Robson (CUNY)

*Evidence*

Rose Zolteck-Jick (Northeastern)

Michael Arien (St. Mary's)

Please contact the above planning coordinators if you would like to join a planning group, are interested in developing teaching materials, or have other suggestions.

We are still seeking planners for civil procedure, contracts, property, and commercial subjects. Please call either of us – Zipporah Wiseman (617) 354-2277 or Anne Goldstein (413) 782-1446 – if you are interested in helping to plan these workshops.

We would like to urge, implore, and entreat those of you who are currently using or working on relevant material in any of these subjects to send them now to the planning coordinators for groups with same, and otherwise to Zipporah or Anne.

Also, we need videotapes of actual or simulated classes (or portions thereof) in which you have successfully or unsuccessfully tried to integrate class, gender, race, disability and sexual orientation into your teaching. We are looking for videos to use at the conference.

Modest sums are available for secretarial, xerox, or research help with materials and to subsidize those conference planners whose schools will not reimburse the costs of their attendance at the conference. ■

*Continued from page 4*

thereof, to the students' conduct. We are also aware, however, that when incidents of this kind occur at institutions other than Harvard, they garner significantly less media attention. Therefore, we would appreciate receiving any information you may have regarding similar incidents in your or other law schools, whether or not you consider such incidents to rise to the level of illegality under federal or state civil rights or state tort laws.

We are especially interested in information about an institution's response to incidents of harassment (including, but not limited to violence) and, in particular, responses that you consider to be especially creative. Please send information, including relevant newspaper articles or internal memoranda, to: Professor Paulette Caldwell, Chair, SALT Committee on Hostile Environments, New York University School of Law, 40 Washington Square South, New York, New York 10012. You may also contact any other member of the Committee (Patricia Cain, University of Iowa; David Kairys, Temple University; Arthur Leonard, New York Law School).

We welcome personal stories that were never the subject of public complaint or controversy. We also welcome anonymous information, and we will scrupulously respect whatever restrictions you place on the use of the information or the identity of individuals or schools. Vulnerable people often believe that public complaints generate adverse consequences. We believe these stories are valuable, even though they necessarily represent only one perspective on an incident that likely has different meanings to different participants.

We would also appreciate hearing from you if you have questions about this undertaking or think that it should be expanded to include additional related matters of concern to you. We would also welcome volunteers for membership on the Committee. ■



## AN INSIGHTFUL LOOK AT LAW SCHOOL

— Sylvia A. Law  
New York University

Two years ago SALT published the third edition of *Looking at Law School* (Stephen Gillers, ed., 3rd edition, 1990). It is an extraordinarily good book that has gotten steadily better. As you will see from the table of contents, it includes essays by a very impressive group of SALT members. The authors convey both a passionate enthusiasm for their subjects and a sharp and informed critique of many aspects of legal education.

Over the years, many of my students have told me that *Looking at Law School* provided their best source of information about what to expect from law school. Other students have told me that the essays on the first-year subjects made all the difference in helping them to understand both the law and the methodology of legal education. Women, minorities, gay and lesbian students, and parents particularly appreciate the essays addressing the special problems they confront.

---

*"... best source of information  
about what to expect  
from law school."*

---

*Looking at Law Schools* is available in paperback for \$9.95 from Penguin Books, 375 Hudson Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. I hope you will order a copy to read for yourself. If you like it, give copies to young friends considering law school and recommend it to your students. Apart from the fact that it is a very good book, SALT earns royalties on every sale.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### Preface

William J. Brennan, Jr.  
Associate Justice, retired  
United States Supreme Court

#### Introduction

Norman Dorsen  
New York University

#### PART ONE - Deciding to Go to Law School

Making the Decision to Go to Law School

Stephen Gillers

New York University

Selecting a Law School

Gerald Lee Wilson

Duke University

Financing a Legal Education

John R. Kramer

Tulane University

#### PART TWO - The Law School Experience

Psychological Problems of Law Students

Bernard L. Diamond, M.D.

University of California, Berkeley

Advice for Minority Students

Charles R. Lawrence III

Stanford University

Issues of Special Concern to Women and Parents

Carole E. Goldberg-Ambrose

University of California, Los Angeles

Advice for Lesbians and Gay Men

Rhonda R. Rivera and Robert L. Eblin

Ohio State University

The Messages of Legal Education

Sylvia A. Law

New York University

#### PART THREE - First-Year and Required Courses

The First-Year Courses: What's There and What's Not

David L. Chambers

University of Michigan

Civil Procedure

Judith Resnik

University of Southern California

Contracts

Robert L. Bard

University of Connecticut

Criminal Law

Lloyd L. Weinreb

Harvard University

Property

Curtis J. Berger

Columbia University

Torts

Jeffrey O'Connell

University of Virginia

Constitutional Law

Paul Bender

Arizona State University

Legal Writing

James Boyd White

University of Michigan

#### PART FOUR - Special Courses and Course Selection

Planning a Three-Year Course Program

Robert A. Gorman

University of Pennsylvania

Legal Ethics

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.

Yale University

Clinical Studies in Law

Gary Bellow

Harvard University

Legal Philosophy

Anita L. Allen

Georgetown University



## EDITOR'S PREROGATIVE... A Personal Note

My wife Ilisa, our 2-year-old son Travis and I would like to announce the birth of our twins, Emily Jade and Hayden Kahana, on July 2, 1992. We have also taken this occasion to change our surnames to Rooke-Ley, which was my father's surname . . . and mine, until I was given my step-father's name (Burns) at age 5. Got it? Each of us is happy and healthy . . . and very busy adjusting.

Our law school has also moved into a new building on the main university campus. Your comments and suggestions for The Equalizer, which are always very welcome, should now be sent to me at Nova University, Shepard Broad Law Center, 3305 College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314; telephone: (305) 452-6161; fax: (305) 452-6227.

— Michael M. (Burns) Rooke-Ley

## CHICAGO MEETING SEPTEMBER 19TH

SALT's Board of Governors will be meeting in Chicago on Saturday, September 19, 1992 at 10:00 a.m. at Northwestern University School of Law.

Any SALT member is welcome, of course, to attend this meeting. At 5:00 p.m., Chicago-area members will be honored at a wine-and-cheese reception, which will include a brief program describing SALT work in progress. Members are also invited to join Board members for an informal dinner thereafter.

Chicago-area members who would like to join the Board for this party, or for dinner afterward, should call Cynthia Bowman's secretary, Marie Lionberg, at (312) 503-8579. ■

## SOCIETY OF AMERICAN LAW TEACHERS

### MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

- ☐ Enroll/renew me as a regular member. I enclose \$50.00 (\$35.00 for those earning less than \$30,000 per year).
- ☐ Enroll/renew me as a contributing member. I enclose \$100.00.
- ☐ Enroll/renew me as a sustaining member. I enclose \$300.00.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

School \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Make check payable to: Society of American Law Teachers

Mail to: Professor Stuart Filler  
Bridgeport Law School at Quinnipiac College  
Room 409  
600 University Avenue  
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604-5651



## **Society of American Law Teachers**

### **President**

Sylvia A. Law (NYU)

### **Presidents-Elect**

Patricia A. Cain (Iowa)

Jean Love (Iowa)

### **Past Presidents**

Norman Dorsen (NYU)

Howard Lesnick (Pennsylvania)

David L. Chambers (Michigan)

George J. Alexander (Santa Clara)

Wendy W. Williams (Georgetown)

Rhonda R. Rivera (Ohio State)

Emma Coleman Jordan (Georgetown)

Charles R. Lawrence III (Stanford)

Howard A. Glickstein (Touro)

### **Past Vice Presidents**

Anthony G. Amsterdam (NYU)

Derrick A. Bell, Jr. (Harvard)

Gary Bellow (Harvard)

Ralph S. Brown, Jr. (Yale)

Thomas Emerson (Yale)

### **Treasurer**

Stuart Filler (Bridgeport)

### **Editor**

Michael M. Rooke-Ley (Nova)

### **Historian**

Joyce Saltalamachia (New York)

### **Board of Governors**

Barbara Babcock (Stanford)

Katherine Bartlett (Duke)

Mary Becker (Chicago)

Cynthia Bowman (Northwestern)

Haywood Burns (CUNY)

Patricia A. Cain (Iowa)

Paulette M. Caldwell (NYU)

Charles R. Calleros (Arizona State)

Martha Chamallas (Iowa)

Richard H. Chused (Georgetown)

Jerome Culp (Duke)

Clare Dalton (Northeastern)

Harlon L. Dalton (Yale)

Leslie Espinoza (Arizona)

Stuart Filler (Bridgeport)

Howard A. Glickstein (Touro)

Linda Greene (Wisconsin)

Phoebe A. Haddon (Temple)

Angela P. Harris (Berkeley)

Sylvia A. Law (NYU)

Arthur Leonard (New York)

Jean Love (Iowa)

Holly Maguigan (NYU)

Judith Resnik (USC)

Dean Rivkin (Tennessee)

Michael M. Rooke-Ley (Nova)

Joyce Saltalamachia (New York)

Elizabeth Schneider (Brooklyn)

Aviam Soifer (Boston)

Nadine Taub (Rutgers-Newark)

Gerald Torres (Minnesota)

Stephanie Wildman (San Francisco)

Patricia J. Williams (Wisconsin)

Zipporah Wiseman (Texas)

Steve Wizner (Yale)

---

### **SALT Newsletter**

Michael M. Rooke-Ley, Editor

Nova University

Shepard Broad Law Center

3305 College Avenue

Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314

NON PROFIT ORG.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
FT. LAUD., FL  
PERMIT # 886