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New Director, New Direction: 
Sarosi Brings Both to M-Law

By Erick Ong

The University of Michigan Law School (UMLS) has a long tradition of developing lawyers who work to serve the public, whether by devoting their careers to public service or by serving the public good in other ways.

After the departure of Dean Robert Precht, who was the former head of the Office Of Public Services, the search committee worked to find someone who could fill the void. The search committee sought out applicants who understood the difficulties involved in obtaining public interest jobs, who could develop a network of contacts to make the job search easier and more productive, and who would have the enthusiasm needed to be a compassionate counselor and a champion for students. The Law School believes they have found this person in MaryAnn Sarosi.

Sarosi earned both her BA in history in 1984 and her JD in 1987 from the University of Michigan. Sarosi founded and served as executive director of the Coordinated Advice and Referral Program for Legal Services (CARPLS), which became the gateway and referral center for all of Chicago's legal services offices.

In 1997 Sarosi served as associate executive director of the Michigan State Bar's Access to Justice Program and was awarded the American Bar Association's 1998 Harrison Tweed Award for outstanding leadership and commitment to providing low-income people with access to justice. For the past three years Sarosi has spearheaded an independent consulting practice supporting legal services programs, nonprofit agencies, courts, policy and other law-related entities on service delivery and intake issues. This past summer she was integral in formulating the new Pediatric Advocacy Clinic.

I was able to speak with Director Sarosi, who was already busy getting up-to-speed with the innerworkings of the Career Services office and counseling students in their areas of public interest.

RG: How did you become interested in public service?

MS: Growing up in the southwestern parts of Detroit I witnessed first-hand the struggles that people endured and the role that the community and public services played in helping shape and enrich their lives. Being a child of immigrant parents, one who lived during the time of Nazi Germany and the other in Communist Hungary, I learned that we are truly privileged to live in a democratic society. Using the education I gained from the Law School, I decided to dedicate my career to helping to better people's lives through public works and through the justice system.

RG: How does the Public Service Program compare to when you were here at school? Also, how does it feel to be back at UMLS?

MS: Actually when I was here we didn't have a Public Interest Program. The program started in 1994 and at least since then the school has started to promote a culture in public interest. It is funny that you ask that as it was a little intimidating coming back to the Law School. I had Douglas Kahn for income tax when I was a student here, and the

Continued on Page 13
Editorial: Two Lists Should Solve Student Spam

The law school student e-mail listserv has always been a lightning rod for debate and annoyance among the student body, and recent e-mails (and subsequent student removals) highlight this continuing e-mail saga. The Law School Student Senate (LSSS) monitors and moderates the listserv.

The official LSSS policy states that "Students using the [lawstudents] listserv for solicitations, personal statements, or for duplicate lost/found notices for the same item will be removed from use of the listserv after the first offense. This includes solicitations or other improper emails made to appear as notices that would otherwise be appropriate under the listserv use guidelines."

The regulation seems fairly unambiguous; nevertheless in recent weeks several students have been removed from the listserv for both clearly and arguably violative e-mails. The general understanding is that the listserv should be used only for student organization-related announcements and lost/found item e-mails.

Many students feel the policy is too restrictive, and that students looking to advertise non-student organization-related events or social opportunities should be able to do so since the annoyance of an unwanted e-mail is slight to a disinterested party. Others look at the listserv as a complete e-mail cluttering annoyance and feel that even stricter moderation should be enforced.

LSSS backs up its policy with at least two lines of reasoning: That any student who wishes to create an unmoderated e-mail list (for advertisement of parties, spare football tickets, and the like) can do so and allow whomever he or she wants to opt in. Further, they point to the law school classifieds page, linked to off of the official Law School Docket at: http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/docket/index.htm, as a centralized place for ride sharing, lost/found, and buying/selling of items.

The opportunity to communicate a message to the entire law student body directly is a powerful tool; LSSS has done an admirable job in moderating use of an e-mail tool that, according to more veteran students, has been something of a mess in recent years. However, removal of a student from the listserv for an innocent communication to the student body seems to create more hard feelings than it needs to.

An equitable solution is obvious: the creation of two LSSS-administered law school student listservs. One list, the current one, would remain designated specifically for student organization announcements. The only authorized senders would be leaders of student organizations or their designated communications officers. The other list, built from the same initial database, would serve as a law-student wide list for car rides, social announcements, tickets for sale, lost and found, and so on.

The key difference between this second listserv and one created by a student is in the inclusion and moderation. LSSS’s role in this second listserv would be to include all Michigan Law students and allow each student to opt out if he or she would rather not be burdened with excess social e-mail. Further, a moderator would be essential to ensure that the list isn’t completely misused as a vehicle for personal agendas or attacks. If a second law student listserv were to be instituted, we’d all feel better if LSSS were behind it (as opposed to some random student). In a year where the power of voting has been brought into the
Hard Day's Nights: MBA Alum Describes Show Business

By Meg Barnard

Last Thursday, Michigan MBA graduate Candace TenBrink spoke to business and law students about careers in the entertainment industry and her personal career path. TenBrink, business strategist turned Wall Street banker turned actress, is now heading her own independent film company, Altos Productions. TenBrink is co-President of the University of Michigan Entertainment Coalition and VP of the Entertainment and Media for the Michigan Business School Club of New York.

According to TenBrink, her MBA degree has been an important factor in her success. It allows her to speak the same language as the potential investors with whom she does a great deal of business. It also gives her the credibility that can help her get through the door. A J.D. degree, she said, would be similarly helpful. But that is just the start.

TenBrink recommended for a young lawyer hoping to become established in the entertainment industry to do the work whatever the cost. This means locating in a city that matters (for movies and television, New York and Los Angeles; for theatre, Chicago), finding a firm that does independent work (the bigger the better), and offering help, in some cases accepting little or no money or credit. After making contacts and learning the ropes, he or she can build his or her own client base and practice. People start pursuing careers in entertainment all the time—start with them. And after that, “Always be looking because you have to have something else lined up. You never know what’s going to happen.”

TenBrink explained everyone has their own situation and level of comfort. She admitted that a very supportive husband deserves much of the credit for her risk taking and persistence. TenBrink explained that the investment of time and effort a person is able make in an unsure industry will lead to more or less aggressive routes for different people. “This business is worse than Wall Street,” said TenBrink. It is emotionally and financially difficult. There are a few people making a lot of money in this area. To get to that point, you have to self promote. “You have to be a commando. At the end of the day it’s a who-you-know game.” The good news, according to TenBrink, is, once you are in, you’re in, and the entertainment industry is full of people who are truly passionate about what they are doing, making for an excellent work environment. “Here is my opinion of the best way to do it,” said TenBrink. “Don’t compromise . . . The more entrepreneurial you are, the more you’ll be able to do.”

Altos Productions emphasizes female empowerment in its productions through strong female roles and a female director. In addition, Altos features the products of little-known clothing designers and the like by using these products in movies. The University of Michigan Entertainment Coalition is a directory of current and past Michigan students, who have an interest in the entertainment industry. Its aim is to create a worldwide network of contacts from which shadowing, mentoring, job, and other opportunities may arise among the Michigan community.

For more information about TenBrink or Altos Entertainment, go to www.altosentertainment.com. For more on the University of Michigan Entertainment Coalition, go to http://www.uofmentrencertainmentcoalition.org or write Marta Almli at 545 N. Hayworth Ave. #103, Los Angeles, CA, 90048.
The room was packed, the pizza was gone, and the Federalists and American Constitution Socialites were getting along. Litigation of the highest level hung in the air.

The professors speaking at the Supreme Court Review last Tuesday seemed to think there would be few surprises in the decisions facing the Court this term (after all, these same judges have been together for ten years). Still, some major issues concerning federal sentencing guidelines, searches and seizures, the death penalty for minors, and medicinal marijuana are on the docket. A quick review:

The first panelist, Professor David Moran discussed a case concerning vehicle searches and predicted the death of the federal sentencing guidelines. As for seizures, Moran predicts that the Court will continue along its path of providing few protections for people in vehicles. In the case, Illinois v. Caballes, a sniffer dog was called out to a routine traffic stop. The dog (without a warrant, not that he would have cared), smelled the car and sat down. “The doggie equivalent of j’accuse,” according to Moran.

“A sniffer dog was called out to a routine traffic stop. The dog (without a warrant, not that he would have cared), smelled the car and sat down. ‘The doggie equivalent of j’accuse,’ according to Moran.”

Our professor isn’t even trying to teach us about sentencing because it’s all up in the air. Moran’s (and almost everyone else’s) prediction is that the sentencing guidelines are going down, jury trials rule, (and next semester’s Crim class is going to have to deal with the consequences). Advantage: Summer Starters (oh no you di’nt!)

Professor Sarah Cleveland spoke about Roper v. Simmons, challenging the constitutionality of executions for people who were under 18 at the time of their crimes. Apparently, the US has executed more juvenile offenders since the 80s than any other country – (Texas, actually, could carry the US by itself. USA! USA!) Cleveland predicts that this case is going to follow the “evolving consensus” argument made in Atkins, basically giving weight to popular opinion that it’s not okay to execute retarded people. This would be good because that means they’ll probably find the practice of executing minors cruel and unusual.

But for those internationalists out there, a bummer because they’ll fail to pay any lip service to international condemnation of the practice. Who cares about what France (and the UK, and Japan, and the rest of the goddamn free world) says anyway? Advantage: Palau. And don’t forget about Poland.

Professor Richard Friedman spoke last, and since people were pretty much ravenous from pizza withdrawal anyway, it must have seemed appropriate to talk about weed. Specifically, he discussed the question of Congress’s power to preempt California’s “Compassionate Use Act” legalizing medicinal marijuana. The things is, the federal government has the Controlled Substances Act, which pretty much means a conflict of laws. The Court would probably like to overrule the state law, but this would be opposing the federalist stance the court has taken in recent years regarding the Commerce Clause.

Since 1995 the Court has been reluctant to let the federal government overrule the states – overruling the state law would go against this trend (and pretty much everything the Court conservatives claim to stand for). So the Court can either reverse directions, or, you guessed it, let California run loose with their glaucoma and smoke until they can see straight. Advantage: Guy on the couch.

Oh, and one more thing: Dean Caminker reminds us all to watch Colorado during the election this year (and for all of you who didn’t go to either this talk or Professor Primus’s lecture, it’s worth repeating): There’s a popular initiative to have a proportional number of electoral votes sent to electoral college, rather than winner-take-all as is usually the case. If polls go the way they’re going, there will probably be a 5-4 split in the nine votes.

Here’s where it gets interesting: if one of the candidates wins the state but is missing the rest of those votes necessary to claim the office, there might be a Constitutional challenge to the initiative. This means the Court might be choosing another President...
40 Years in the Making:
Professor Kahn Talks Tax, Teaching

By Meg Barnard and Lisa Blackburn

Douglas A. Kahn, the Paul G. Kauper Professor of Law, celebrated his 40th Anniversary with Michigan Law School this year. Kahn teaches Tax Planning for Business Transactions, Taxation of Individual Income, Corporate Taxation, Partnership Tax, Estate and Gift Tax, and Legal Process. He has written widely on federal taxation and is the co-author of two casebooks, one on corporate taxation and one on taxation of transfers of wealth. Professor Kahn has also written several textbooks on those subjects and on individual income taxation.

His most recent article, "Income Tax Definition and Treatment of Private and Charitable Gifts and a Principled Policy Justification for the Exclusion of Gifts from Income" was published in the Notre Dame Law Review. The co-author of this article is his son, J.H. Kahn, who doesn't just teach law—but he teaches tax law, just like his dad.

Prior to beginning his academic career, Kahn practiced in Washington, D.C. and served as a trial attorney with both the Civil and Tax Divisions of the Department of Justice. A graduate of the University of North Carolina and of George Washington University Law School, he joined the Michigan Law School faculty in 1964.

Professor Kahn spent some time with us last week. After our interview, he let us see the State Street traffic from an entirely new perspective: watching from the little balcony attached to his office.

RG: You are celebrated by many law students as one of the rare Republican voices among the faculty—

K: Almost unique! (with hearty laughter…) Putting me on the endangered species list, I think!

RG: With the Presidential election coming up, we wanted to ask you about the differences in the candidates' tax policies.

K: I think there are a lot of differences. One never knows what they’ll really do—and I don’t mean that they might not want to do certain things—but there are pressures that keep people from doing all they want. I think there are a vast number of differences. First of all, on taxation of businesses that are incorporated abroad, Kerry has made it very clear that he wants to reduce some of the tax benefits that foreign subsidiaries have in order to create, if not a deterrent, less incentive for businesses to go abroad. Kerry believes that current tax advantages (mostly tax deferral) are one element causing the outsourcing of jobs. Bush has no program for that and would not go that route. You can argue about whether Kerry’s proposal is a good or a bad thing. The question is, what effect does it have? Some say that the business operated abroad will be moved to the U.S., some say that the business now operated abroad will be lost and those jobs will not return to the U.S. because the American taxed businesses cannot compete with foreign companies who are subjected to lower taxes. Moreover, jobs in the U.S. will be lost because American businesses that are servicing the foreign subsidiaries will no longer have that business to perform.

So that’s one possibility; another is that the capital gains tax is currently fifteen percent and Kerry will clearly want to raise that. I don’t think he would be able to—and probably would not even try to—change it by statute; it’s scheduled to expire. I think he’d just let it expire, but he would clearly change it. And, it’s part of Kerry’s plan to place a heavier tax on higher income people. Now that’s not going to raise as much revenue as is estimated. One of the problems with taxing revenue is that it gets less when you tax it—it has an effect on it. That’s one of the problems with estimating a consequence of any tax change—once you change the tax, you change the climate. And so, after looking at what happened in the past, you have to make estimates of what is going to occur differently. In other words, if you tax capital gains at ordinary income rates, you will not have the same amount of gain. There are other factors at work, but the capital gains rate is one of the factors that has helped the stocks go up. If you take that out, the stocks are likely to fall. Now other factors may push it up, but the tax will have an impact and that’s why

Continued on Next Page
it's difficult to predict the consequences of adopting any tax provision. The government makes estimates of what the revenue change will be, but they are very rough estimates because you've got this extremely difficult task of determining what will occur. At any rate, Kerry will do that. Partly, he plans to use the additional revenue to finance other expenditures—Kerry has a large number of expenditures that he wants to make. I don't think anyone who has looked at his plan would say that the additional revenue he would raise could possibly cover those expenditures—or anywhere close to it. So he's going to have to do something somewhere else or stay with deficits.

I don't think Bush would lower taxes, but he wants to retain the cuts that he made. And we're in a terrible deficit situation, so if you retain those cuts, and you don't cut spending in any significant way, the deficits are going to continue. In the short range, that's not so bad. In the long range, that's very bad. On the question of what you can do to cut expenses, there isn't a great deal because of defense and the terrorist problems—both of them are going to have to deal with that. And there isn't much you can do in cost savings—if anything, they might go up. Then you've got the big items—entitlement, social security—well, anyone who would try to do anything to social security would be lucky if they were left alive, much less in office. There are a whole lot of elderly people who would sharpen their knives, so that's not really feasible. There may be ways of putting ceilings on it—Bush has some plans—privatizing and so forth, which could have some impact. There are others who are very nervous about that, understandably.

So those would be the significant differences, I think. There are always other forces at work. Kerry says we've got to raise taxes, but there are some he won't want to raise. It all depends on your constituency and ideology. Some of the provisions put in by Bush as cuts were aimed at minimizing the so-called marriage penalty. When a couple gets married, if they are both earning roughly the same amount, there can be a tax penalty in that they will pay more taxes together than they would pay if they weren't married. On the other hand, if there's a difference in the amounts they each make, then they may get a marriage bonus—they may actually pay less tax than they would have if they had remained single.

Now there are actually far more people getting a marriage bonus than there are paying a marriage penalty, but the people who are paying a marriage penalty are very well educated, articulate people who make their position and concern extremely well known—and effectively. So Congress acted to minimize that in ways that also reduce some taxes, and nobody wants to fool with that. Those people run for office—they don't want to aggravate a large number of people. So, I would say that there are significant differences and people have to decide. Both of them will use emotive arguments as to why one is better than the other.

RG: As we law students consider our finances after graduation, what sort of tax shelters or tax breaks should we be thinking about, whether we take the route of firm jobs or public interest?

K: Well, it's a problem to have a tax shelter without a fair amount of wealth to invest in it, so the first thing you have to do is to accumulate. You have to be careful what you mean by tax shelters. There are some very elaborate schemes that are, in my view, highly abusive. Some of those are held by very wealthy individuals, but they have been used mostly by corporations. These have been packaged and sold sometimes by accounting firms, sometimes law firms, but mostly accounting firms and investment banking firms, and they are sold on a large-scale basis. Many of them came with an agreement not to disclose what it is you're doing, and there has been some concern about whether those confidentiality agreements should be barred because they do interfere with discovery.

A lot of these schemes, in my view, should not work. The only reason they are successful is that the service just does not have the wherewithal, the number of employees, and the means to go after them and if they did and litigated hard, I think those plans would fail. Now that's not true of all of them—some of them I think would stand that kind of attack. But I think a lot of them would not. So the question is what do you do about that? I think that what Congress has been talking about and doing is the best solution. Rather than fiddle with the substantive tax law in any great amount, what they've done is required disclosures and heavy penalties so that there are costs to trying those schemes. Right now, a lot of times if you lose, all that happens is that you just end up paying the tax and the interest on it. If you impose a heavy cost, then there is a deterrent to people going in and trying these.

On the other hand, there are areas where the government has deliberately set up what you could call a tax shelter. These are not abusive in the sense that Congress has decided that for some principle, they wanted to allow and encourage people to do this. Medical savings plans, for example. Cafeteria plans that employers allow fringe benefit areas where you are not taxed. Deferred compensation pension plans, and so forth. Normally, there are a few of these that you can choose to go into: IRAs—you can choose to set up your own deferred comp, with very limited amounts. Keoghs. Some of those have costs and you have to decide whether the costs in your case amount to more than makes it worthwhile. That's mostly what you would have at this time. There are some kinds of investments which are given tax preference, but what happens is that the benefit the investment provides will be reflected in the return the investor receives. If you went out and bought state bonds, you would get lower interest rates than you would get if you bought a corporate bond because the state knows that you don't get taxed on the income from their bonds and so they
do not have to pay as much interest as corporate bonds pay to attract the investment they need. The state must set the interest rate high enough to attract taxpayers in a low enough bracket to raise all of the investment the state needs, and those in higher brackets will gain a windfall in getting a higher rate of return than would be needed to attract their investment.

Someone in a lower tax bracket may do better to purchase a corporate bond. Some of the fringe benefit plans require the commitment that funds set aside be used only for specified purposes, and if they are not so used, in some cases you will lose the dollars that were set aside, and in some cases you may be able to carry those unused dollars over and use them later. You have to look at it in isolation and decide whether the tax deferral is worth it at this point in your life. Now I think everyone should be trying to put money away in deferred comp. I think you should do it even if the government didn’t allow a tax break. You do get old—I know it’s hard to believe when you are that young, but it does happen. You should have money set aside—you don’t want to have to make it on Social Security.

RG: You are talking specifically about Roth IRAs?

K: Roth IRAs are one possibility. There are, for example, in a lot of employment plans, contributory elements where you are allowed to contribute additional amounts. For example, when I came here, I started doing that at the maximum from the very first day I started working here and when you talk about forty years later, that money has had an opportunity to grow. It really comes to a significant difference in what you will have on retirement. Now, not everyone can afford to do that. Some of my colleagues couldn’t do that. They had other costs that they had to incur and they couldn’t invest additional amounts in some of those early years and had to begin investing later, but they lost those huge growth years because so much time passes before they will start drawing on it.

RG: Some people have this crazy perception that tax law is dry. In your opinion, what is exciting about it?

K: I DO think that tax law is very exciting. First of all, we’re talking about how the government is allocating among its citizens the burden of paying for the cost of carrying on the activities of the government. This means that A LOT of value judgments go into this.

First, the idea of distributive justice: Who should be paying? How should we allocate it among the different income classes? These ideas are interesting in themselves. Once you start taking money away from citizens, you’re going to affect decisions; it’s going to have an impact on what they do and what they don’t do. This is inevitable; whether you want to do it or not.

So, knowing this, does it make sense to try to shift money from wealthier to less wealthy people? And should the tax not simply be allocating costs in an equitable fashion, but be designed to redistribute wealth so that it is spread differently from the way the market would allocate it? These are all interesting questions in themselves. You HAVE to talk about some of this in basic tax courses.

Then you get into other questions. The tax law operates on people’s legal status, privileges, and property rights. How do you determine what these are? Tax law doesn’t determine those; local law does. So, tax law comes into play only after you apply local law to see what people have. So, the Tax lawyer is in many ways one of the last generalists in society, because to get to the tax issue, you have to resolve numerous local law issues. Tax law has to be taken into account when working in many other legal areas, such as: torts, divorce, corporate practice, and real estate.

Now, why do I like Tax law so much? I am not as interested in the distributive justice/economic effects part—not because it’s not an interesting and important issue, but it’s not what motivates me. I just LOVE dealing with complex statutes. I think that dealing with, and working your way through, and analyzing/triying to make sense of and harmonize these statutes, is like a puzzle. I like to play chess. People who like to play with these kinds of things can find pleasure in this. I enjoy the game. I enjoy trying to solve these issues. It’s more than just learning how to read a statute. After you have read a statute, you then have to try to determine what that statute was designed to do. What was its purpose? What evil was it aimed at solving? Then, you can construe the statute and apply it to specific situations. Does the proposed application of a statute to a specific set of circumstances conform to the overlying purpose of the statute, or not? I find this fascinating. So, I get an intellectual pleasure from it.
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Others have different reasons why they go into the law and why they go into tax. Their emphasis is more on concern about distributive justice, what the economic effects of tax provision are, and examining other kinds of tax systems that might be adopted.

RG: Besides playing chess, what do you in your spare time?

K: I do play a lot of chess. I don’t play as much now, but I do like it. I enjoy live theater and go each summer to the theater festivals at Stratford and Niagara-on-the-Lake. I also like sports—I especially like to watch sports. I am a very strong Wolverine fan. In fact, I was the faculty representative to the NCAA and Big 10 for U of M for 3 years (as he proudly shows RG staff the plaque hanging in his office). I was appointed in 1989, I remember that because I went out to Seattle and saw Michigan win the National Championship that year. I served from 1990-1993. After that, I worked with the athletic department until the ADs changed. I was sort of an unofficial troubleshooter. They’d come when they had some problems, and they wanted to make a case to the NCAA or the Big Ten, and I’d write something up for them. I wasn’t officially a member, but I would help out.

RG: You’ve won the L. Hart Wright Award for Excellence in Teaching. You’ve clearly had a fantastic career. What makes a good professor, and what advice would you give to an aspiring law prof?

K: I feel blessed that I’ve had the career that I have had. I can’t imagine doing anything that I would have enjoyed as much. People go into teaching for different reasons, and I am probably unusual in this regard. I think that law practice was fun, by the way. Not everyone does, I know. But had I not gone into teaching, I would have enjoyed it. But not as much.

I think it’d be a mistake to go into teaching if you didn’t want to do both teaching and writing. Most people go into teaching for the research/writing, and the teaching is secondary. I was the other way: The teaching is what I wanted to do most. Of course I wanted to do both, but between the two, the teaching is what I love and enjoy. The research/writing is of course important, and it takes a lot of discipline and hard work.

At times during my career, I had offers to go to other schools who offered me lower teaching requirements. Many faculty members would prefer a lighter teaching load. But I didn’t want to teach less. Today, there is much more writing in academia than there was when I came in—that is one of the reasons why there is less teaching today. If it were up to me, I’d rather have professors do more teaching and a little less writing. I’m not sure if all of that writing is worthwhile, but some of it is. Some of it I still wonder about.

RG: What can someone do to get into teaching?

K: Well, the first thing is obvious: get the highest grades you possibly can. But this shouldn’t discourage someone who doesn’t have top grades. If you want to go to one of the top schools, you either have to get top grades, or you can start at a school with lower status and work your way up. But high grades alone won’t get you into teaching today. You need to have written at least one, or often two pieces before you will be hired. I don’t like this requirement; it wasn’t necessary when I went into teaching. It leads faculties to be “overrepresented” by certain types, and this means that you’re excluding others. For example, if someone goes into practice and does commercial law, it is very demanding. I spent six years in practice; working nights and weekends—not only on the problems, but on educating myself in the field. I didn’t have the time to do the type of scholarly work that is often necessary today (to get a teaching position). It’s hard to self-educate yourself today because the hours you need to put in for your clients are much greater than they were when I was in practice. So, these people are pretty much cut off from having time to write.

So, we’re actually striking out of the academic profession people who should be considered. We’re losing some valuable resources.

RG: 2004 celebrates your 40th Anniversary here at U of M. You mentioned that throughout your career, you had received offers from other schools. What made you stay with us?

K: I think that this is a wonderful institution, and I have very close friends here. The closest I ever came to leaving here was to go to Duke—I had received offers from them three different times. I am from North Carolina, and I had an offer from Chapel Hill, but that wasn’t as attractive as the Duke offer. They offered me two tickets to all of Duke Basketball games, and to the ACC championship game, for each year for the rest of my life. And that made it very tempting. I like the people at Duke; I love that area of the country, and I have family there, so that all made it very hard.

But when I thought about leaving here, I got very despondent. I have too many close friends here: JJ White, Tom Kauper, Yale Kamisar, and many others. I just didn’t want to part from that.

I’ve grown to love Ann Arbor. I think that had I received an offer from Duke during my first couple of years, I might have gone. But I love the students here. I have taught in other schools, but I have never had any group of students that I have enjoyed as much as the ones I’ve had here.

RG
The Good, the Bad and the LLC: Alums Show How to Distinguish Law Firms

By Shannon Griffin

Perhaps you are a fortunate 2L trying to sift through numerous offers from law firms around the country. Maybe you are a 1L still trying to figure out what law school and law firms are all about. Or possibly you are a 3L unsure about what you really want in life. Whatever your situation, Bill Meyers, ‘87 from Goldberg, Kohn in Chicago and Kimberly McDonnell, ’91, from Pillsbury, Winthrop in San Diego, two well-established Michigan Alums with years of experience interviewing young lawyers, were here to help. If you missed the opportunity to hear them speak about how to distinguish law firms, this article will be as informative as the real thing.

Things to do before the initial interview:

McDonnell suggests taking a personal inventory before doing anything else. Decide what makes you tick and where you would feel most comfortable. Where will your talents be best displayed? After you have that list, go to the websites of different firms that strike your interest. One informative site is www.pillsburywinthrop.com. Here you will find a list of recommended questions for the interviewee on his or her firm visit. Classic examples of such interview questions are: What type of client contacts do you have? Why kind of a workload do you have? Do you get to work on a variety of different things? Meyers thinks these questions are great, but he advises not to stop at the initial answer. An associate may respond to your question about client contacts by saying, “Yeah, there are a lot of client contacts”, but this does not mean anything. You must dig deeper. “What kind of clients? Are the partners involved or are you on your own? Does working on a variety of things make billing difficult?” These follow up questions are how you truly get a feel for what the firm is about. Meyers assures that it is completely appropriate to probe a little bit.

What to do after receiving an offer?

Go back! After you receive an offer, go back and talk to other people in the firm. This is under-utilized. There is nothing wrong with asking a firm for an opportunity to return after an offer is received. Of course, you must be respectful of the time, but both Meyers and McDonnell agree that you can learn a lot about the firm from the answer you receive from that request.

Also, use your Michigan resources. Ask others that have worked at the firm during the summer what they liked and disliked about it. Talk to other people who have received offers from the firm and ask them what they are planning to do. Do they want to go back? Why or why not? You should not be shy about asking the firm for contact information so you can find other people to talk to.

General Tips:

McDonnell reminds not to talk too much about the interviewer. If you do research on the person who will be conducting the interview, don’t be too obvious. It may make them feel stalked. She also suggests tailoring your list of questions based upon your personal inventory. For example, if rankings are of particular importance to you, that should be on your list of questions. If diversity is big, ask about the number of minorities and/or women in the firm.

Give information about yourself. McDonnell says that interviewees are afraid of showing their real personality. The school of thought is that if you don’t give away too much of yourself you reduce the chances of rubbing someone the wrong way. But she suggests that there is a middle ground. Your personality will come out eventually. Better this happen at the beginning instead of after you are hired, and you find out it isn’t the place for you. The firm may be in a better position to figure out if you will be happy there if it gets a feel for the real you during interviews. McDonnell’s final advice: “Don’t be afraid to trust your instincts. Narrow the choices down of objective criteria, but once you get down to the nitty gritty, make a judgment based on your gut reaction.”
In Their Own Words: Students Comment on the 2004 Presidential Candidates

Arranged by Karen Lockman

‘The World Needs President Bush’

By Weston L. Hall

The United States stands at a crossroad in its history.

We need a strong principled president with the courage to make tough choices without asking the French or the United Nations for permission. The world needs President Bush. President Bush has a proven record of defending America, and we are a stronger country because of his leadership.

“President Bush has a proven record of defending America and we are a stronger country because of his leadership.”

The President’s opponent, who has spent twenty years in the Senate, has mentioned nothing of his legislative record. This is a bizarre campaign strategy. Perhaps it is because Kerry is on the wrong side of history on nearly every issue. Kerry has taken nearly every side of every issue with no coherent policies presented in the course of his campaign. With Kerry’s few policy positions implemented, the condition of our country would be grim.

During the 80’s, Kerry was pushing for a nuclear freeze while Reagan was winning the Cold War. If Kerry had his way, the United States military would not be equipped to defend us. He voted against nearly every weapons system used today. Kerry’s 50-cent-per-gallon gas tax suffered bi-partisan defeat each time he proposed it. When he proposed cuts in the intelligence budget, the bill was so out of touch not a single senator would co-sponsor it. In addition, Kerry plans to raise your taxes, redistributing your wealth to those who chose not to accumulate $70,000 in student loans but rather wait for the Democrats to give them someone else’s money.

This election is the most important of our lifetimes. The direction of our great country and the world depends on an America that will lead the world and defend freedom for all people. That is why on November 2, I plan to vote for John Kerry...right before I vote against him.

Bush ‘Faced With (an) Impossible Task’

By Joanna Jackman

After September 11, 2001, President Bush was faced with the impossible task of trying to prevent the next terrorist attack. He also knew that as devastating as September 11 was, it could be dwarfed by a terrorist attack involving weapons of mass destruction. So the good news was that he knew that there were a limited number of regimes that had weapons of mass destruction. But the bad news was that he knew that there were a number of those regimes, such as Iraq’s, had connections with terrorists, and he had to do something to prevent those regimes from providing weapons of mass destruction to terrorists.

On September 12, 2001, everyone believed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction – U.S. intelligence, British intelligence, Russian intelligence, President Clinton, President Bush, even John Kerry. It now appears that everyone was wrong. President Bush has acknowledged that and is taking steps to fix mistakes at our intelligence agencies.

However, on September 12, 2001, President Bush didn’t have the benefit of hindsight that we have now. Instead, he...
Bush ‘Crappe Out’ In Iraq

By Ali Shah

To borrow a phrase from Rudyard Kipling, President Bush made one heap of all his winnings (the international goodwill towards the U.S. abroad post September 11), risked it on one turn of pitch-and-toss in Iraq, and crapped out. The WMDs and flowers at the feet of the U.S. troops never materialized, and the credibility of advisor Paul Wolfowitz and Bush’s merry band of neo-conservatives quickly vaporized. What is left behind in Iraq is a formerly secular nation now Balkanized into Sunni and Shi’ a zones of control, with little to fill the power vacuum other than scores of foreign and domestic militants long suppressed under the dictatorship of the Hussein regime and ignited by the presence of a western occupier.

For ordinary Iraqis, freedom without security is a half-empty glass at best. A classic line from Stanley Kubrick’s Full Metal Jacket sums it up: “I guess they’d rather be alive than free, the poor dumb bastards.” The level of animosity towards the U.S. around the world is beyond comprehension, and this is a direct result of the policies of President Bush, who after four years of thumbing his nose at the international community now has the gumption to solicit more international help in Iraq. Do we need the help? Of course. Will we get it while Bush is president? Not a chance.

It matters that Senator Kerry would rather work with the U.N. than against it, not because he has any interest in delegating responsibility for U.S. national security to an international body but precisely because he would be acting in U.S. self-interest by internationalizing the conflict and minimizing the U.S. role. It’s Bush’s war and President Kerry would be stuck with it. President Bush pulled off one of the great national frauds in our history by managing to convince much of the electorate that the Iraq war is somehow a part of the “War on Terror.” It isn’t. It never was. Undoing that con game in the national consciousness, if nothing else, would be justification for a regime change of our own.

‘Think About Bush’s Decisions Since 9/11’

By Mike Songer

On social issues, the 2004 Presidential election is pretty simple: if you are like most Americans, you are far more comfortable with John Kerry than George Bush. Think about Bush’s decisions since 9/11. Following the terrorist attacks, it wasn’t enough to round up hundreds of “Arab-looking” men (virtually all of whom had no ties to terrorism).

Bush asserted the right to hold American citizens indefinitely in secret detention without access to counsel – a position so extreme that even Justice Scalia castigated it.

Despite the threat posed by these “Arab-looking” men, Bush still found time to distract Congress with the, ahem, “urgent” quest to keep devoted gay couples from getting married. Such bigotry was no surprise to me; as a South Carolinian I remember when Bush condoned the state’s flying of the Confederate Flag during the 2000 primaries. (Kerry spoke out against the Flag and opposed the FMA.)

Bush’s intransigence isn’t limited to people of color and homosexuals; he wants wealthy white men to make reproductive decisions for women and their doctors, and he blocked research on new stem cell lines that could dramatically improve the lives of Americans suffering from ALS, Parkinson’s, and Alzheimer’s. (Kerry is pro choice and supports robust stem cell research).

Education? Kerry supported fully-funding “No Child Left Behind,” but Bush let his party cut the necessary money. (What’s more important – tax cuts for millionaires, or books for poor school children?) And while Bush enthusiastically supports tax breaks to corporations who outsource jobs, and affirmative action for children of wealthy alumni, he has no sympathy for working-
IMPOSSIBLE TASK, from Page 10

had to make decisions within the framework of what he believed to be true at that time. And what he – as well as the majority of U.S. Senators and Representatives — believed at the time was that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. Furthermore, President Bush – as well as the majority of U.S. Senators and Representatives — believed that Iraq’s possession of weapons of mass destruction posed a threat to the United States serious enough to send brave American men and women into harm’s way.

I was working on Capitol Hill on September 11, 2001. I recognize that Saddam Hussein had NOTHING to do with the attacks of that day. But I also recognize that after September 11, President Bush not only had the duty to pursue the perpetrators of this evil, but to prevent it – or something worse – from happening again. And in going to Iraq, President Bush did what he believed he had to do – just that.

If given another four years in the White House, I believe that President Bush will continue to move heaven and earth to keep the American people safe. And post-September 11, that’s the type of President I want in the White House.

“THINK ABOUT,” from Page 11

class minority students applying to Michigan Law School. (Kerry would end tax breaks for outsourcing and supports affirmative action.)

To recap: beware of open-minded and tolerant people, doctors, school children, homosexuals, women, Alzheimer’s patients, and, especially, “Arab-looking” men. Don’t let them steal our country! Vote George W. Bush in November!

Bush ‘Practices What He Preaches’

By Shad Kidd

President Bush will continue to fight for the American family and to support traditional morals. He has led the way in increasing family budgets and enabling families to choose their own paths, and he will continue to do so. He stands by his positions, and those avowed by the American people and enshrined in the Constitution and can be counted on not to pander to whatever crowd happens to be in front of him or to undermine American interests in the face of international pressure. He actively advocates traditional family values and morals and practices what he preaches.

President Bush has actively advocated for education and has put policies in place which encourage accountability and make available funds to improve the education of all of America’s youth. He has increased funding and opportunities for education at all levels. He is committed to providing our children with the tools they will need to succeed and supports the policies that will ensure they will be able to employ their skills domestically and abroad.

His personal convictions and stances allow him to provide the strong leadership our country needs right now. He is a strong military leader and, regardless what your stance on foreign policy, our military needs strong leadership it can support. President Bush can provide that leadership; Kerry cannot. Look at intra-military support for the President.

In sum, President Bush is the leader our country needs right now. He has the moral character and the backbone to do what is best for America, just as he has for four years.

LISTS, from Page 2

spotlight, it is clear the best system would put the power of review with elected LSSS members, who answer to the students they represent.

Relying on the law school classified advertisements as a means to distribute messages is somewhat limiting. The classifieds are a passive means of communication and much less powerful than the ability to e-mail the student body. Many students do not realize the classifieds exist or the frequency with which they are updated.

The creation of two LSSS-administered listservs is an easy compromise that involves a little more heavy lifting from the Student Senate – but should put the e-mail list controversy to an end. If LSSS members wish to continue serving their classmates needs, the creation of a second listserv would create the greatest benefit for all law students with minimum output.

Instead of attempting unrealistic goals, such as athletic equipment in the Lawyer’s Club basement, it would help continue the trend of growing confidence in the actions of LSSS to create the second listserv. It’s the way to go.
Health Insurance: Do You Want It More Than ... 

Submitted By Ryan B. Parker

The coverage you need at a price you can afford." That's the catchy slogan for the University of Michigan Health Insurance Plan. So let's play a little game. How much do you think the "price you can afford" is for a married law student and his non-student wife to get the health insurance that they need for one year? Do you think it is more or less expensive than going on a spending spree and buying 71 of those awesome $80 case books you had to get for class? Do you think the "price you can afford" is more than buying say, 1,530 sandwiches at Potbelly's or Jimmy John's? How about this one? Do you think the price our hypothetical student will pay for health insurance for him and his wife over the three years he is in law school is more than one semester of his law school tuition at one of the most expensive law schools in the country?

I imagine that by now you are getting bored with my little games so let's cut to the chase. For a married law student to buy health insurance for himself and his non-student wife through the suggested University of Michigan Health Insurance Plan he would have to pay $5,741 dollars a year. Yes, that is more than it would cost to buy 71 case books or 1,530 sandwiches. That's a whopping $17,223 over a three year law school career, more than the price of one semester of law school.

But at least they're hitting the people who can afford it. $5,741 a year for a student who is already tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars in debt is a drop in the bucket, right? The results of my expansive and reliable poll of at least six law students leads me to believe that instead of forking out the ridiculous amounts of money needed to get health insurance, many students (OK, only two of the six I talked to) simply go without. I was surprised to find that a couple of the other students had wives and kids on Medicaid. So where does all this leave a new law student trying to figure out what to do about health insurance? The answer: with a lot of questions and no real answers.

So here are the questions. How does one of America's finest universities, a school that boasts a world class medical school and has its own hospital, have students at its highly ranked law school who are priced out of health insurance? How is it possible that a law school with a highly intelligent, sincere, and interested administration can have students who are forced to risk living with out health insurance?

I'm not pointing a finger at a guilty party; to be honest, it's such a complicated issue that I wouldn't know where to start if I were. I do want to point out a problem. And I'd like to be able to afford at least one or two of those case books and a couple of those sandwiches.

Ryan B. Parker is a LL. E-mail comments about this article to rg@umich.edu.
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other day I had to fight back my urge to call him "Professor" Kahn.

RG: What are some of your goals for the Office of Public Service?

MS: In coming into this position I did not have any specific goals or any mandates from the administration of what to do or what not to do. But part of my job is to open doors for students and to be a conduit of information and contacts for public interest that we should utilize. I other departments on campus such as the Ross School of Business, School of Public Health, Public Policy to tap into all the resources we have. I believe that many faculty members have backgrounds in public interest that we should utilize. I also wish to promote the ethical obligations we as legal professionals should have towards public service.

RG: What is the most important piece of advice you can give to a student?

MS: To be flexible and creative. I recently had a student come in who was faced with the dilemma of whether to pursue a big law firm job or public interest. The student's interest was in international human rights and he did not find any public interest positions that fit that description. I was aware of an EU integration fellowship that was not exactly geared towards international human rights, but if one were creative enough one could tailor it to focus on asylum refugee issues, immigration laws and other social issues.

I encourage everyone to drop by and say hi to Mary Ann Sarosi, the new Director of the Office of Public Service. Her office is in Room 217 Hutchins Hall and her office appointment hours will be Monday through Thursday from 3:30PM to 5:00PM, with open hours on Wednesday from 10:00AM to 12:00PM.

Even if a career in public service isn't your primary interest, the personal and professional benefits you will reap from pro bono work can be immeasurable. In addition to fulfilling your professional responsibilities and obtaining personal satisfaction from such work, pro bono can lead you to gain unique insights and perspectives on the legal profession.
Come On and Take a Free Ride: Anatomy of a Callback

By Matt Nolan

7:15 A.M. (Wed): Wake up. Pee. Stumble into the living room, turn on a couple lights, flip open the laptop. Check email – delete 18 pieces of spam received since last checked at 2:20 A.M., read 3 actual emails, respond to two.

Check cnn.com, collegefootballnews.com, and electoral-vote.com. Check email again.

7:45 A.M.: Shave. Shower. Put on clothes. Make sure clothes and books are packed into bag so as to be able to fit into overhead. Check for third time to make sure suit is in luggage (Pearson). Put on other suit. Leave.

9:05 A.M.: Tax class.


10:40 A.M.: Arrive at Wayne County Airport. Spend 15 minutes looking for a parking spot. Panic. Finally park. Walk rapidly about 12 miles carrying luggage through parking lot looking for terminal. Check in. Strip to underwear to get through security. Smile back at girl who’s watching.

11:30 A.M.: Sit down at a Coney Island for lunch.


11:59 A.M.: After sprinting through the terminal in a suit, finding car in parking lot, digging phone from under the seat, sprinting back to terminal, getting through security (stripping down again, winking again), and sweating more than the entire Detroit Pistons squad in triple overtime – arrive back at the gate with a new land-speed record.

12:20 P.M.: Commence usage of in-flight overhead fans to dry self.


200 P.M.: After carrying bags in and getting a sympathy Diet Coke, commence interview one at firm #1. 2nd year associate, very high-energy, picture of the Big House on the wall. Definitely works long hours but is married and has family time. Sure. Partners are the nicest in town. Sure.

2:30 P.M.: Interview two. Partner in a corner office – I mention the view and we talk for 13 minutes about September 11th and what it was like in the Sears Tower. Quick transition into, “So, what was it like being student body president at a school like Michigan? Pretty exciting, huh?” This guy seems genuine – not overworked, unlike some others I met last week.

3:10 P.M.: Interview three. An associate who was at the office until 4 A.M. last night finishing a deal because it was leaked on Wall Street at the end of trading. Super-caffeinated. Seems like another really fun guy, much like the 1st. Definitely trying to sell me more than grill me. I can handle this. Time to go on the offensive?

3:45 P.M.: Interview four. 3rd year associate who does bankruptcy. Less energetic. She seems to really like her job – on a committee where associates decide firm management stuff, so I grill her. How many hours? How are benefits?

Partner/associate relations? How’d you get on the committee? How many assholes here? She goes along and I’m having fun.

4:15 P.M.: Interview five. Another partner. I don’t remember this interview one week later.

4:45 P.M.: Head to hotel. One night here must cost more than I made...well, all summer last summer. The lobby is not a “lobby” I am informed – it is “the living room.” My room has the most comfortable bed on earth. I lie down on it because I am exhausted. I notice mood lighting on the ceiling – nice. Check out the mini-bar. $4 bags of M&Ms. $5 for a mini-can of Pringles. $10 for a “personal convenience pack,” which when I read the small lettering I realize is two condoms. $10! Time to hook into $15/day internet and check that email and news again...

7:00 P.M.: Meet three associates from firm #3 for dinner. REALLY fun people. We have three rounds of drinks before ordering, then after “unique” appetizers, a delicious something fancy for dinner. Dessert is sorbet for me.

10:00 P.M.: Meet fellow 2L at the Signature Lounge on the 96th floor of the Hancock Building. 2 drinks each and a plate of cheese later I’m down $60. I don’t care. I love Chicago.

12:00 A.M.: Sleep in my comfy bed.


8:30 A.M.: Breakfast at McDonald’s. Chew gum.

Continued on Page 17
By Mike Murphy

If all break has come and gone, and if you blinked, you missed it. You can say the same about the semester thus far - for us second-year students, time is ripping by. Some of us are jet-setting and trying to keep up with friends and student orgs by sending frantic e-mails from airport cafes, some of us are in sub-3 tearing through the bluebook with bleary eyes, and some of us, occasionally, are in class.

So in a fit of magnanimity for our bleary eyes and full calendars, the school gave us a day off. A day off. Monday. One day off. Thanks.

But the ABA has a regulation, apparently, that tends to make a lot of smart people (us) extremely confused as to what day it is. Thus, last week Tuesday’s classes were actually Monday’s classes. So Monday was canceled, Tuesday was Monday, but Wednesday went as scheduled. Thursday and Friday were non-plussed. Thursday and Friday were non-plussed.

Thing is, this was an exceedingly difficult concept for many of us to grasp – it spawned more than one official e-mail describing the class change and the policy implications behind it. A break from the Pavlovian 55-minute routine is one thing – but Monday’s classes on Tuesday? Inconceivable.

I’m not making fun, either. I’m illustrating a point about myself, which I (sincerely) hope extends to other law students. For example, I’m writing this on what I think is Wednesday, but I’m not entirely certain. No, I haven’t become so engrossed in law school that I can make an argument that due to ABA regulations and policy considerations (and equity) that Wednesday may in fact be, for all intents and purposes, better suited to occur on Thursday. No, I’m saying this because I set my alarm, woke up and went to class this morning thinking it was Thursday. It wasn’t. I missed my first class completely not because I overslept, not because of a fly-back to Tulsa, not for any reason other than I somehow had no idea what day it was. You’d think I’d have thought Wednesday was Tuesday, since there was no Monday this week. But oh, not! For some reason today felt like Thursday.

At least I know that it’s October. But, apparently, I’m still fuzzy on the year.

To introduce this story, let’s get this out of the way. At the ripe age of 25, I owe back taxes. It’s not my fault – an accounting error between a company I did contract work for in 2002 and a miscalculated form 1099 has resulted in me owing a small sum of money to the IRS. No big deal. All I have to do is send them an installment every month.

Easy. A simple task that a 10-year old can handle without screwing it up. The correspondence between me and the IRS is funneled through my permanent address in Farmington, where my parents live. Yesterday, which I think was a Tuesday, I received this e-mail.

Word for word, this is my father’s e-mail to me: “The IRS sent you a letter, received today. They returned your check. You apparently dated it 9/21/03 – the incorrect year. The IRS said it cannot accept or process a check more than 6 months old. You are asked to re-issue the check made payable to the United States Treasury. Send a copy of this letter with form 3699 (whatever that is). They also enclosed a self addressed envelope. See you soon. Good luck.”

(My father’s habit of brevity and my penchant for proximity are indicative of a real juxtaposition of character. We’re dead ringers for each other at our relative ages, we even have the same dumb smirk, but we’re almost entirely different people. For example, my father drives a car like an older man who has spent over 30 years of his life working in automotive safety. I drive a car like a younger man who has never been involved in a serious car accident).

So, how in the hell did I somehow flub the year on a check in SEPTEMBER? I think I may be completely losing my damned mind. The IRS must think I’m an incredible deadbeat. I will now send the check for the cable bill to the federal government, and my taxes to the dentist. That’ll keep them off my back for some time.

Having lost the day and the year, I turn for solace and sympathy and belonging to the only other people in my life who have no concept of what time of day or night it is – in reference, for them anyway, to times in which it’s considered socially polite to not make an incredible amount of noise. They’re my neighbors, and I call them The Louds.

The Louds live in the apartment across the driveway from my living room. Their balcony is, literally, a Jackie Chan jump away from my front door. The Louds live in a messy two-bedroom apartment in which the lights have never been turned off, the blinds have never been shut, with three rooms filled with upwards of 17-18 loud undergraduate women at any given time. Every time I leave, they’re on the balcony. Every time I come home, they’re on the balcony. You can’t help but notice them. Why?

Well. Not once have I ever seen a male in The Louds’ apartment, and I’ve pinpointed the source of that oddity on the very real fact that they appear to be staggeringly obnoxious. They have conversa---

Continued on Page 19
Law School Welcomes New LSSS Senators

By Diana Mack

As we head toward Election 2004, there is at least one aspect of the upcoming vote that we can predict with confidence: voter turnout in November will be nowhere near the turnout we saw this fall for the election of our own student senators. Results for the election of 1L student senators showed that nearly 70% of 1Ls participated in the election. So just what exactly is the Law School Student Senate (LSSS), and what can it do for us?

Whether you are concerned about such basic issues as the diversity of our faculty or how our school administers its grading policy - or maybe just looking forward to the next Bar Night, the LSSS plays a key role in the social life of the students and the policy-making of the administration. As the “voice of the students”, the activities of the LSSS are extensive and affect all of us in one way or another.

On the social front, the Student Senate is responsible for allocating funding for all student organizations, and sponsors a number of Law School social events. The Senate is planning an active social agenda that includes “record-breaking bar nights”, a huge Halloween party and Prom, and the return of Bar Month and the Ding Party. Along with the Faculty/Student Wine & Cheese, LSSS also plans the Talent Show, and is hoping to plan a skate night and a spring BBQ. Senate members are also involved with a wide range of student services projects - from wireless access to running the list serv and preparing for the visit by Justice Scalia.

But the LSSS not only works to keep the beer flowing. The Senate serves as a vital link between the students and law school administrative policy - and gives voice to the students in areas that affect all of us, including faculty hiring, grading policy and the OCS. Two of the Senate members are currently working on assessing the grading policy of Michigan - and are finding out that Michigan’s grading curve is one of the strictest of any of the top ten schools. As a result, Michigan law students may have more lower grades than their peers - which puts us at great disadvantage in the job market. Indeed, it would seem that such a grading policy would also seem to have a “chilling effect” on our sense of community here at school.

The President, Jay Surdukowski, is deeply concerned over the level of grade anxiety, and is dedicated to promoting a policy that will help us build community. Jay encourages everyone to get as involved in law school activities as they can. He also suggests we should all be a little wary over the chase for the big bucks at the big firms - and hopes that students will remember why they came here in the first place. LSSS can play an important role in promoting school policy that supports and encourages those who wish to pursue less financially lucrative fields, such as in public interest.

Of personal concern to Surdukowski is the Solomon Amendment and the greater debate in society over gay rights: “Every time JAG is on campus, this Law School breaks its non-discrimination policy. This fact will stay with us for as long as we live. My parents were both in the United States Air Force and I was born on base. The U.S. military I was raised to love led the way to integration in the late 40s. Where is that old, brave leadership?”

Surdukowski’s passion for the issues and his resolve to do something about them will no doubt serve him well as our Senate President this year: “In 2004 we live and breathe a civil rights battleground,” he said. “This Law School must not sleep. Some criticize the Senate for getting involved with affirmative action/ the Grutter case and Don’t Ask Don’t Tell/Solomon Amendment. But I suggest we must do what we can in our communities—whether we are U.S. Senators or the pint-sized M-Law kind. We send leaders into the world. These fights for our minds and hearts are not misguided. Our hearts have not hardened yet.”

The senators encourage you to contact them - and welcome your interest and ideas. Please stop by at the next Bar Night and congratulate this Fall’s new 1L representatives!

How does the LSSS operate?

The Student Senate has a total of 17 senators - 4 officers (President, Vice President, Treasurer and Secretary), 4 1L reps, 3 2L reps, 3 3L reps, 1 LLM rep, and 2 Board of Governors representatives. The
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9:00 A.M.: Interviews at firm #2 commence – my on-campus interviewer informs me I’m lunching with one of his “favorite associates” at the firm... who it turns out I went to high school with. Interview with four partners and one associate – firm is more collegial, less social – or is part of that the fact that these are partners instead of associates?

12:00 P.M.: Lunch at Joe’s Stone Crab. Best steak I have ever eaten in my life. My buddy from high school and I catch up, and the other attorney with him is extremely attractive. I wonder if it may be smart to take another job just so I don’t have a conflict of interest in asking her out some day. I’m not joking – the thought crossed my mind as a factor. Dessert of delicious chocolate something of course – no callback lunch is complete without a dessert bigger than most lunches I eat. Total bill for the three of us for lunch: $180 before tax and tip.

2:15 P.M.: Back to the hotel. Check phone messages and have my 1st offer from last week – SCORE. Strip out of the suit. Too tired to put on other clothes so put on one of three plush robes in the room at my disposal. Call parents to see how they’re doing and give them updates. Check email/news. Read from the 9/11 report.

7:00 P.M.: Cab to Lincoln park. Order $35 pizza, within my $40 dinner stipend. Meet friend from undergrad and his friends to watch the 8:00 P.M. (Central) presidential debate. Start slamming Sparks. The four of us can’t finish this $35 pizza. Bush babbles a bit, looks annoyed. Kerry stronger than I thought he’d be on presentation. If people were reading this transcript Bush would be winning, but Kerry wins on presentation by a mile – even I can’t deny that.

10:00 P.M.: Walk to Duffy’s, the Michigan bar in Chicago. Waiters have “Chicago’s Big House” logo on their shirts. Drink many White Russians.

12:00 A.M.: Say goodbye, hail cab, back to hotel and my comfy bed.

9:00 A.M. (Fri): Afternoon interviews are NICE. Wake up. Order $14 omelet and $4 Diet Coke from room service, just within my $20 breakfast limit. Watch debate analysis and Sportscenter. Check email. Drink water to fight hangover. Shower. Dress.

12:00 P.M.: Check out. Give bags to guy in lobby who seems way too excited to store them for me. Time to kill, so I find a diner to read in. Still full from the omelet. Drink a Diet Coke. Spent last of cash at bar last night (oops), so excuse myself leaving book as collateral and find an ATM. Pay my $1.34 and leave.

1:15 P.M.: Arrive at building for interview #3. Check messages one last time before going up, and have two. Crazily enough, both are offers... one from last week and one from Wednesday. I must be getting good at this schmoozing thing – after 23 20-minute interviews on campus, 25 30-minute interviews on five callbacks, and five extended “interview” lunches, I’d hope so. Call Dad so he can brag at work.

1:30 P.M.: Arrive at office of #3. Associate who interviewed me on campus and went to dinner with me on Friday comes in, gives me the run-down. People are extremely friendly – almost as low-key as Muskegon! Much less energy flowing around this place, but I could see myself very happy here. Partners have kids’ pictures on walls – not sterile. Final partner of the day, with chest-hair jutting out of his shirt (it’s casual Friday after all) tells me he’s the “cut the shit” guy, and we chat about me leaving the firm after a few years to run for Congress back home. He likes it. Wonder what those other firms would think? Why didn’t I ask? Was I in sell or buy mode? Which am I supposed to be in?

5:00 P.M.: Finish interviews. Chill in 1st associate’s office – chat about the week. Walk back to hotel, try to grab luggage but instead have it carried to the cab that is hailed for me. Ride to airport. Sit in terminal for a few hours – flight is delayed. Try to stay awake.

11:45 P.M. (EDT): Land in Detroit. Terminal is empty. Get to car, drive back to town. Out of gas so stop to fill up. Forget to turn headlights on for the 1 mile drive back to my apartment, and in doing so get flagged with a $130 ticket from a cop training a new recruit – I laugh it off because I’m too tired to be pissed and still feeling good about those offers.

12:45 A.M.: Arrive home, check email, and go to sleep. Sixty-five and a half hours after starting. Gotta love 2L.

Matt Nolan is the Executive Editor of Res Gestae. Questions? Comments? Phone numbers? Send em to mnolan@umich.edu.

LSSS, from Page 16

President and Vice-President serve as a kind of “executive branch”, overseeing the various projects and duties of the Senate and presiding over meetings.

The Secretary sets the agenda for the Senate meetings, and keeps the school informed as to the Senate’s doings. The class reps take on various projects of the day, as well as initiate their own endeavors, such as those that may arise out of concerns from their own class. The Board of Governor reps sit on the governing body of the Lawyer’s Club to assist in policy-making. The Senate meets once a week and opens up its meetings to all law students.

The officers and all upperclass representatives are elected each spring, in what can be a very competitive race – complete with unofficial running mates, candidates’ forum and posters plastered throughout the halls. In the Fall, ILs and LLMs elect their senators – with one from each of the four first-year sections, and one LLM rep. All positions are for one year (except for Governors which have two years), and reelection is possible.
Hanging Around: Students Make Use of Quad, Fleeting Good Weather
Question on the Quad: What’s the sexiest law term?

"Penal' is pretty cool."
A Disheveled Backpack, 2L

"Dicta', as in 'Justice Learned Hand was caught holding his dicta.'"
Ryan Roman, 2L

"We don’t know any law phrases...er...maybe 'court.'"
Liz Liebschutz and Jonathan Clark, 1Ls

"Law itself is pretty unsexy, but Catherine MacKinnon introduced me to the term ‘fuckability.’ I guess that’s legal."
Becky Chavez, 2L

LOSING, from Page 15

The Louds bring joy to my life. Once a night or so on the weekends, when they apparently stay in all night, I’ll be leaving to go somewhere and see them break into a spontaneous dance party. The song is always “Nasty Girl” by Nitty, and despite several full run-throughs, they still haven’t grasped any of the lyrics except for the chorus.

If I sound like I’m jealous - I am. I have to schedule a 5-minute visit to the Career Placement office in my Outlook calendar or it might not get done. I live half an hour from home and have told my family I don’t have time to see them for the next four weeks. I only eat standing up or moving. The Louds? They have no such time management constraints. Sure, we both have no idea what time or day it is - me because I’m busy, they because they’re inconsiderate - but they appear to be having, at any given moment, a lot more fun than I have. Actually, they don’t just appear to be. They’ve said so! “I'M SO DRUNK, THIS IS AWESOME!” for example, is something I heard yesterday.

Yesterday, as I write this, was a Tuesday. In 2004. Oh, yeah. I know what year it is. I know what day it is. I know where I’m going and I have an idea what I’m doing. It’s just moving at a rate so fast it’s tough to pick up. Blink, and I’ll see you at Thanksgiving. And if anyone from the IRS asks for me, tell them I already put the check in the mail – tomorrow.

Mike Murphy is a 2L and the Editor-in-Chief of Res Gestae. His credit rating is surprisingly strong for someone so disorganized. E-mail Mike at murphym@umich.edu.
VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

WORK WITH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL KIDS!

Assist K-5 students at Pittsfield Elementary (off Washtenaw near Arborland Plaza, about a 10-minute drive from the law school).

One hour a week, during the regular school day, according to your schedule.

Having your own transportation is ideal, but we will arrange carpools if you do not.

Email availability or other questions to Dan Rubin at rubindan@umich.edu

Space is limited, so contact us soon!

Send Your Student Organization Announcements to rg@umich.edu

---

NOAM CHOMSKY

Illegal But Legitimate:
A Dubious Doctrine For the Times

Academic Freedom Lecture
Thursday, October 28
4 - 5 p.m. 100 HH

Surf Club's
3rd Annual
Cedar Point
Coaster Trip
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2004
Leave Quad at 3:30 PM, back by 1 AM
Cedar Point, OH about 2 hours away (www.cedarpoint.com)
2-for-1 deal is ON only $13 each!
Contact Dawson Williams at wildway@umich.edu to arrange transportation and commit to an evening of pure fun.

DEAN'S PUBLIC SERVICE FELLOWS PROGRAM
$5,000 fellowship available to 20 2L's in exchange for working that summer in a government or nonprofit job.
For more information, see: http://www.law.umich.edu/currentstudents/PublicService/

THE DATE AUCTION!
Thursday, October 28
Tickets on Sale October 25-28 HH100