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Parental Immunity: Mixing Casebook and Child
"Will Trade one Dr. Spock for one Prosser & Keeton"

By Mony Ghose and Greg Castanias

For most law students, the pressures of school are enough. There are, however, students who have even more responsibility than Civil Procedure or Law Journal: the care and raising of children.

Pam Dils is a single parent every other week and during breaks. Her five-year-old daughter, Lindsey, is a balancing factor in the hectic universe of law school. "When I go home, it's a completely different environment. It reminds me that there is so much more out there," says Pam. Surprisingly, Pam finds that she gets more done when Lindsey is around. "She makes me keep to a schedule. It's good discipline."

Second-year Jo Hamilton cites her children as the best support she had in her decision to start law school. She and her husband Ogden have two children: 8-year-old Kirk and 10-year-old Amanda. Kirk and Amanda can't wait for Mom to become a lawyer. "They thought the LSAT was all there was, then they thought finishing the first year made me a lawyer," Kirk, who used to complain "All you ever do is study, study, study," is now "making noises about becoming a lawyer," says Jo.

Amanda, too, has been affected by her mother's career choice. "She's changed her career aspirations. She now says she wants to be either a doctor, lawyer, or anthropologist—whichever goes to school the least." During Jo's first year, Amanda would change the dinner table conversation by asking, "Mommy, did you read any interesting cases today?" Jo said that the children were most interested in the criminal law cases.

Another first year who raises more than his blood pressure is Craig Bobay.

Craig returned to school after working as court administrator in the Allen Superior Court for some years. His wife and two daughters (Elizabeth - 7-1/2 yrs. and Mollie - 8 mos.) still live in Fort Wayne, where Craig spends most of his weekends. "I try to get as much as possible done Monday through Friday," says Craig. Continuity in the raising of Elizabeth was an important factor in the Bobays' decision to stay in Fort Wayne, where Craig hopes to practice after graduation.

The most incredible parenting story belongs to second-year Lowell Haines. Lowell and his wife Sherry adopted a baby girl, Hannah, toward the end of 1988. "We have been going through an adoption process for several years before law school. We had been offered a baby the week before my first year started, but we decided against it for many reasons."

Last semester, the private agency that Lowell and Sherry dealt with arranged for Hannah's adoption. "It's scary because there are no assurances till you actually have the child," said Lowell. Lowell took a week off from school to complete the adoption, but when he and Sherry were halfway to their destination, they called the agency and found out that there was a snag in completing the process. They stayed in a hotel several nights before completing their journey, receiving the six-day-old Hannah, and returning to Indiana.

Hannah, now five months old, presents Lowell and Sherry with the same trials and tribulations of the other law school parents. "The first night that..."
"Parents and Partners Day"

By Len Fromm

Is there life during law school? What kind of a life is it? These questions and all their companions periodically occupy the conversations of law students. Discussions about the nature, meaning, and even the value of legal education are as old as law schools themselves. So also are the differences between discussing these questions with other students who share the experience and discussing them with parents and partners who do not—except perhaps vicariously—have the experience.

Perhaps this has been an unnecessary prelude to highlighting that this Saturday, March 4, will provide the opportunity for your parents and partners to sample your life here (your credibility may be on the line!). In addition to giving family a firsthand glimpse of law school, Parents and Partners Day, it is hoped, will be a day of pleasant socializing and visiting for everyone.

First developed in conjunction with SLA in 1983, this will be the fourth Parents and Partners Day, scheduled on an every-other-year basis. And, if one judges success on the number of attendees, this edition promises to be a real hit. The responses have been amazing. We anticipate that well over 200 parents and partners will attend, almost twice as many as have attended in previous years. Given these expected numbers, it is likely that there will not be room for students to attend any sessions, unless of course one is enrolled in one of the Civil Procedure, Constitutional Law, or Legal Profession classes to be held.

In addition to the regular classes moved to Saturday for parents and partners to attend, a simulated class in Contracts will be offered by Professor Bethel and one in Torts by Professor Dworkin. Professors Conkle and Flood will lecture in areas of current research interest, an overview of clinical and skills courses will be offered. However, parents and partners will have to choose between sessions offered and may need your advice.

Overall, the “day” is an attempt to give a perspective on the stresses, challenges, frustrations, and also the pleasures and satisfactions that all of us have felt going through law school. Steve and I are interested in hearing your comments and evaluation of the program.

Career News

- Watch for upcoming meetings and workshops on:
  - How People Get Jobs — Strategies
  - Dealing with Discrimination in the Hiring Process — prepare for some situations, especially related to sex and discrimination. Learn office procedures and how to file a complaint.
  - Minority Workshop — A Career Job — March 7 at 7:00 p.m. in Room 210 with Dean Motley.
  - Career Decision-making — how to identify legal and alternative careers that are right for you.
  - The Long Distance Job Search — tips and advice from others.
  - Surviving Your Summer Clerkship — hints from survivors on how to complete a clerkship with an offer.
  - Alternative Careers — what's there besides the obvious.

- On-campus Interviews:
  - The Hon. Michael Kanne - 2Ls, deadline 3/16
  - The Hon. Phyllis Kenworthy - 2Ls, deadline 3/10
  - Tofaute & Spelman - 3Ls, deadline 3/3
  - Compuware Corporation - 3Ls, deadline 3/3
  - U.S. Marines - informal informational session 3/6 at noon in Rm. 122
  - U.S. Navy - JAGC lawyer to speak to students on 3/14

- NALP Apartment Guide, 1st Ed. available March 10... provides information on apartments in most major cities.

The Exordium

The Exordium is published by the Student Law Association with the help of student volunteers. The next issue will be available in April. The editors are currently accepting articles and letters for publication for that issue. Items should be turned in to John Bessler’s mailbox. All opinions expressed in The Exordium are those of the individual writer and do not necessarily reflect the view of the students, faculty, administrators or University. The editors reserve the right to edit any letters or articles or reject items which do not fulfill editorial goals. Any upcoming events should be put in Pete Raack’s mailbox for publication in the next issue.
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Home-field Advantage Betters IU Trial Teams

by Ben Beringer

The appellate advocacy hysteria that gripped the IU School of Law has led many a law student to overlook what it is actually gives advocates a chance to present briefs and oral arguments to a supreme court: the trial.

For six IU law students who traveled to Chicago two weeks ago, an appeal was the furthest thing from their minds. Instead, they were experiencing the rough tumble of actual trial work as they competed in the National Trial Advocacy Competition sponsored by the National Institute of Trial Advocacy.

This year’s topic came out in December. The case involved violence against an officer during a DUI arrest. The prosecution alleged that the defendant resisted arrest; the defense contended that defendant’s actions came in self-defense. Involving the rough and tumble of actual trial work as they competed in the National Trial Advocacy Competition sponsored by the National Institute of Trial Advocacy.

The competition consisted of two preliminary rounds. The top eight teams on the field of 19 advanced to the final rounds.

Representing IU were 3Ls who earned high marks in trial process and the commendation of their teacher. One team was composed of Laura Goodman, Lyn Rosen and Guy Tully. Dave Cox, in Fogel and Matt Wildermuth ended out the second squad. Trial process teacher and Bloomington attorney Vince Taylor coached the two teams. Although each team has three members, only two find action in a particular round. Since both teams must be prepared to take on the prosecution side or defense, two of the team members concentrate on each of the sides while the third person must switch both ways.

Elyn Rosen and Dave Cox were the wing persons” for their respective teams.

In round one, Rosen teamed up with Goodman, as defense, blew up a Valparaiso by earning the best score in all three of the judges.

Rosen’s team advanced to semi-final competition only to be upstaged by the eventual winner and last year’s national champions, Chicago-Kent. Kent did not have last year’s standout, Joel Daily of Channel 7 Eyewitness News fame, but the school did have superior coaching.

“We held our own. We gave a good performance. We were as good as the team that won [Kent]. They were just better coached,” said team captain Rosen.

Cox’s team just missed final round competition. As prosecution, Cox and Fogel lost 3-0 to Northwestern in the first round, virtually eliminating any opportunity to advance into finals. But Cox and Wildermuth took up defense the next day and played spoiler to Notre Dame by upsetting an Irish team that had won a unanimous decision the previous day, thereby keeping the Indiana rivals out of the finals.

Said Wildermuth, “It’s kind of like the Final Four — you want to be in the championship. But the atmosphere of competition and putting on the show and going to trial was rewarding.”

Overall, against Indiana schools IU didn’t lose on a single judge’s ballot. Ultimately, though, the Chicago-area schools dashed IU’s hopes for a national berth.
FORUM
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Supreme Court Shouldn't Have Visited Richmond

By Doug Wright

The following views are mine and do not represent the views of the Federalist Society or its members. But, as a "federalist," I believe the U.S. Supreme Court has no business interfering in the legislative affairs of Congress, much less meddling in the legislative affairs of a community. A clear and persuasive case against a constitutional violation must be the basis for doing so, and in setting aside affirmative action plans, I am not sure that even that is enough.

The issue of minority set-aside programs presents what I believe to be a clashing of constitutional infringements. Affirmative action is a remedial solution to past (and maybe present) racial discrimination. Washington Legal Foundation lawyer Paul Kamenar (one of last year’s speakers at IU’s Federalist Society symposium) has argued that “[m]ost contracts are awarded through competitive bidding, which is quintessentially nondiscriminatory.”

Taken alone, competitive bidding may seem the only nondiscriminatory answer to past constitutional violations of rights through racism. But this is a simplistic view that ignores the indirect impact that past racism has on the bidding process. Considering only the numerous past constitutional violations against America’s minorities, it is clear that the law has served to “set back” the progress minorities would have otherwise made. The primary issue in fashioning a remedy is to put the injured party in the position he or she would have been in but for the violation. It seems obvious that competitive bidding is inadequate if one accepts that past racism continues to impact on the competitive process.

Set-aside programs cannot serve as a perfect remedy for past racism, but are rather only surface remedies for the far deeper reasons minorities are disadvantaged. When trying to create remedies for wrongs such as these, particularly when they amount to wrongs predominately (though not wholly) of another generation, no perfect remedy exists. In the case of set-aside programs, there is less justification for the remedy than in other forms of affirmative action. As California Congressman David Dreier documented so well in The Wall Street Journal a few days ago, set-aside programs are really not benefiting those for whom they are designed.

However, for a generation that did not participate in the Civil Rights era of the 1950-60’s, it is easy to fail to comprehend why minorities doubt that this is the land of equal opportunity, particularly when we offer them colorblind competition. I would suggest that everyone in this category view “Mississippi bellying” and ask themselves whether America’s history of racism might really benefit minorities so far back for so long that no colorblind bidding process will make up the ground that would have been theirs in a nonracist society. It is surely apparent that the result of all this has been “institutionalized” in our ghettos. To give minorities the fiction of a colorblind society is to tell them they must accept that the deck is stacked against them and that there is nothing they will do about it. This hardly puts minorities in the position they would have had but for the constitutional violations that occurred.

This is probably an area where a perfect remedy exists. Some people argue that today’s “majority” generation should not suffer for a past generation’s sins; hence their opposition to set-aside programs. In my opinion, the more pragmatic conclusion would be that policies will have to continue to expand the institutionalized effects of America’s racist past: because there is no perfect remedy, there will be no remedy.

"... I see no legitimate basis for the Supreme Court to intervene."

If communities across America decide to squarely confront the problem stemming from our racist past by supporting local politicians who enact set-aside programs, then I see no legitimate basis for the Supreme Court to intervene. But then, I rarely see a legitimate basis for what comes out of their ivory towers.
Why Use Strict Scrutiny on Affirmative Action?

By Clarence T. Pollard, II

As Justice Marshall points out in his dissent, at least two things impugn the validity of the majority's holding in City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co. The first is the Court's misinformed, erroneous, and incredible conclusion that Richmond had never discriminated against minorities in distributing city construction funds. The error of this conclusion inheres in the Court's inadequately justified refusal to honor the testimony of key Richmond officials and private citizens; its failure to treat the statistical data in the manner demanded by a proper case law; and its mystifying placement of the evidentiary burden on Richmond rather than on Croson. The Court's conclusion is appalling because, as Justice Marshall notes, it simply "blinks credibility" to maintain that the City of Richmond had never, throughout its long and shameful history, been the bastion of the old confederacy, treated its minority contractors with impunity.

The second defect in the Court's holding is its implicit conclusion that the 3% set-aside figure was not only arbitrary stipulated, but excessive as well. In fact, the figure was derived in a manner precisely consistent with recent Supreme Court case law, and thus was hardly arbitrary, and it was not too large because in actual operation the Richmond plan resulted in minority contractors receiving only about 3%, not 30%, of all Richmond construction funds.

What is most unsettling about the case is that the Croson majority adopted "strict scrutiny" as the test to be applied to race-conscious remedial legislation. This is troubling both conceptually and practically.

Conceptually, the use of strict scrutiny to test the legitimacy of legislatively created race-conscious remedies both mocks common sense and trivializes the gratuitous suffering that blacks have endured throughout most of American history. To most blacks, that history is, with few shining exceptions, a doleful litany of unreasoned hatred, unflinching degredation, and institutionalized hypocrisy. It is a tale whose central theme is our often violently enforced obeisance to rules whose content we could not influence, whose hegemony we could not challenge, and whose benefits we could not claim. To blacks, the story of America's past is largely an ugly one, made uglier still by the fact that its cultural, political and economic consequences live today as much in the existence of the black ghetto as in the lingering suspicion that blacks really are inherently inferior to whites.

Affirmative action is both concretely and symbolically responsive to this sorrowful tale. Concretely, it assures meaningful participation in the American Dream by the progeny of those who were wrongly excluded from such participation. Symbolically, affirmative action constitutes an official acknowledgement of the pain and suffering of those excluded on illegitimate grounds, while representing our collective commitment to redressing yesterday's oppression and preventing such oppression from happening again.

Testing concrete applications of these impulses against the implacable demands of "strict scrutiny" betrays the nobility of this enterprise and derogates the gravity of the history on which it is predicated. Using the same legal standard to sound both those policies seeking the maintenance of a racist society and those seeking to unravel it inexorably insinuates that both policies share a common ideology and purpose. It implies, in other words, that affirmative action policies rest on the presumed inherent inferiority of whites, who must be excluded from competition and opportunity altogether lest they wrest capital, power and prestige away from blacks, and who, because they lack political clout, cannot rely on ordinary political processes to safeguard their well-being.

Such predicates are ridiculous. Unlike the blatantly racist government policies directed against blacks as recently as two decades ago, no affirmative action program ever enacted bottoms on the belief—iterated by academy, church, and culture—that whites are inherently inferior to blacks. None seeks to ensure the continued, or even the eventual, political or economic hegemony of blacks.

And none—not even the hated Richmond plan—seeks to exclude all whites from competition with blacks and from the avenues of self-improvement.

But such predicates are more than merely ridiculous; they are also blatently, mordaciously contemptuous of the sensibilities of those, both black and white, who have endured and endure still the long night of American racism. If policies that attempt to help blacks overcome the effects of three centuries of nearly invertebrate racial hatred are now constitutionally to be indistinguishable from those policies that sanctioned our enslavement, exploitation, and exclusion, then not only blacks but those whites who suffered with us in our time on the cross have truly suffered in vain. Croson's standard means precisely that those political actors who would legislatively attempt to help blacks overcome the effects of our long travail would face a stringent constitutional presumption that they are just as corrupt, just as malevolent, as those whose nefarious deeds they would undo.

Finally, as a practical matter, the very fastidiousness of the strict scrutiny standard virtually ensures that its use to test race-conscious remedies will be more than ludicrously premises and viscerally offensive. The routine use of this standard may invalidate a great many legislatively enacted affirmative action programs, especially those arising in...
Croson from pg. 5

area where racial discrimination has been so pervasive, so blatant, and so fundamental that never was there a need to write down unfair rules of play or codify a sketch of an unlevel playing field.

Part of the tragedy potentially at work here is that the congeries of disquieting implications and unfortunate results summoned forth by Croson is not the command of the equal protection clause, and other synchronous mandates, as measures designed to prevent the reenslavement of the recently emancipated blacks belies Justice Kennedy’s assertion in Croson that “racial neutrality” is the “driving force of the Equal Protection Clause.” Rather, a consideration of the history and purpose of the clause suggests that its “driving force” is not neutrality, per se, but non-subjugation. If this be true, then what the clause forbids is not the remedial use of race, but the invidious abuse of race to oppress entire classes of people.

The realization of the practical dangers posed by the use of strict scrutiny to test race-conscious remedial measures may depend on the extent of our society’s racial maturity. There are encouraging signs from many venues in American society that a new day is dawning in our racial relations, a day in which by virtue of goodwill and enlightened thinking all of us will be judged by the content of our characters rather than by the color of our skins, and in which no man will have to sue his brother to force the recognition of filiality or to invalidate official acts of racism. When such a day comes and doesn’t fade, affirmative action will be unnecessary and unjustifiable, and its invalidation by any standard will have no consequence. Certainly, blacks across the nation yearn as fervently as do others for the day in which “neutrality” is indeed the only defensible command of the equal protection clause.

But this day is not yet here. Until it comes, for so long as our sordid past is not really our past, affirmative action should play a vital role in the maturation of America, and legal standards that expose it to routine invalidation will almost certainly do greater harm to blacks than kinder, gentler tests would do to whites.

Shiela Spears and Ed Gregory also contributed to this article.

Satanic v. 
By Marty Huck

Assume Mr. Khomeini brings the defamation suit from hell (that would not die) in U.S. courts, apparently claiming standing either as the agent, representative, or instrumentality of the being who suffered injury to reputation and who will be shunned, ridiculed, and avoided, or as a (politically) interested third party; and claiming jurisdiction under some minimum contacts test based on extraordinary book sales. Assume further (without deciding, of course) that Mr. Khomeini does have standing and the court does have jurisdiction (i.e., assume the case is brought in California), and pretend “just for grins” that the Ayatollah does not get to decide the case and to offer inducements to have it carried out. Now, imagine the pre-trial conference in the first bifurcated civil trial in which jurors must be death qualified.

Counsel for the Plaintiff: Your Honor, I concede that Lockhart v. McCree allowed death qualification based on the assumption that the jury would be only slightly more likely to convict, but that was a criminal prosecution. The Sixth Amendment protection does not extend here, so in this case Mr. Khomeini will not get a fair trial unless the jury is pretty damn sure to convict.

The Court: Counsel for Defense?

The Defense: Your Honor, it’s getting pretty deep in here. I move for a permanent restraining order on counsel’s mouth. And brain.

The Court: Interesting motion, counsel. Maybe next time. [To P:] Counsel, should the plaintiff be allowed to recover punitive without showing actuals?

P: Well, your Honor, it is our position that the damages can be characterized as punitive or compensatory, you pretty much get to pick.

D: Objection. Counsel did not answer the question with a “yes” or “no,” and said “it is our position that.”

Q: Sustained. How compensatory? If you were asking for the potential loss of aid from the West I could see.

P: People’s feelings were really hurt, your Honor.

Q: There certainly may be a question later as to whether the damages are excessive, but we’ll hold that until it becomes necessary to decide. Now why haven’t you settled?

P: Your Honor, we’ve made an offer as to the method of exact categorically rejected, your Honor at hand.

Q: Your Honor, under a choice analysis, Iranian law should apply to this case.

D: Your Honor, I’ve got enough problems if you apply this state’s law.

Q: No, I think that’s right. Iranian law should apply.

D: Waldaminheit! Isn’t Iran an absolute rule of Khomeini, not whatever he wants is . . .

P: I rest.
### Calendar of Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 3</td>
<td>International Commercial Arbitration</td>
<td>3:00-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucus for Women’s Concerns Auction</td>
<td>4:00-6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Bear’s Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delta Theta Phi Initiation</td>
<td>8:00-9:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, March 4</td>
<td>Parents &amp; Partners Day</td>
<td>9:00-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 6</td>
<td>Sherman-Minton Moot Court Preliminaries</td>
<td>3:00-10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, March 7</td>
<td>Minority Placement Workshop</td>
<td>7:00-9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law/SPEA Joint Degree Meeting</td>
<td>9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Nick’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, March 8</td>
<td>Federalist Society Speaker</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, March 9</td>
<td>Christian Legal Society Meeting</td>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>Rm. 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate Legal Assistance Clinic Meeting</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday &amp; Saturday, March 10 - 11</td>
<td>Federalist Society National Symposium - University of Michigan Law School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday - Sunday, March 11 - 19</td>
<td>SPRING BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sherman-Minton Moot Court Regional Round</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 20</td>
<td>Community Forum - “The Right of People with Mental Illness to Refuse Treatment”</td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Monroe County Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday &amp; Thursday, March 22 - 23</td>
<td>Sherman-Minton Moot Court Octo-Finals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, March 23</td>
<td>Caucus for Women’s Concerns</td>
<td>12:00-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian Legal Society Meeting</td>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>Rm. 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate Legal Assistance Clinic Meeting</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 24</td>
<td>BLSA Lecture</td>
<td>2:00-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday &amp; Thursday, March 29 - 30</td>
<td>Sherman-Minton Moot Court Quarter Finals</td>
<td>6:00-10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, March 30</td>
<td>Christian Legal Society Meeting</td>
<td>12:00 noon</td>
<td>Rm. 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Law Society</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inmate Legal Assistance Clinic Meeting</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority Placement Workshop</td>
<td>7:00-9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Rm. 215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Law & Sports Find Common Interest
By Andrew Buroker

Recent events in Oklahoma University's football program may be a nightmare for Barry Switzer, but they are also object lessons in the mix of law and sports for a new student organization at IU.

IL Eric Prime founded the Student Law and Sports Society to highlight the law's role in sports. With Professor John Scanlan as advisor, this new organization will work with the Center for Law and Sports to produce annual seminars to air current issues from all areas of sports related law.

Other recent legal developments in sports, such as the NCAA's Proposition 48 and Amendment 42, collective bargaining, free agency, drug testing, and tort liability workman's compensation for injured athletes indicate this is a growth area for lawyers. Attorneys have long played a role in drafting and negotiating contracts for pro athletes, but now even more interesting practices such as criminal and constitutional law are required of sports attorneys. Recall UNLV Coach Jerry Tarkanian's due process claim against the NCAA lasted ten years and was just decided for the NCAA in the Supreme Court on state action grounds.

These issues provide a variety of topics for academic seminars and conferences. They also provide various career opportunities for law students. Eric Prime encourages any interested students to contact him through his mailbox for further information.

Running From the Law
By Andrew Buroker

The law school track team made an extremely strong showing at the all-campus intramural track meet last Sunday. As defending Big Red relay champions, "Running From the Law" performed well by winning three firsts, two seconds, one third, and one fourth in the finals.

Confessing to being "out of shape but naturally gifted," team manager Christian Morrison led the way by winning both the 800 and 1600 meter runs. In the 3200 meter run, team member Mike Slaughbaugh (MBA) won with Ashley Andrews placing second. Andrews also placed fourth in the 1600 meters, being in better shape but less gifted son.

Mel Moseley won the "Cat" Award by running the fastest of the day in the preliminaries. He second in the finals after pulling string at the tape. Without Mel lightning, the 800 meter relay consisting of Chris van N Boeglin, Chuck Killion and Meldrum (MBA) ran an inspired place third.

Although team standings available by our deadline, "Running From the Law" surely was in top teams of the entire university. Congratulations to all the runners for performances.

Parenting from pg. 1

Sherry left me alone with Hannah, it was 6:15, and she was asleep. I figured to get some studying done. She woke up at 6:30 and cried until 10:30. Sherry came in 15 minutes later and asked, "How was the baby?" I said I'm going to the library. But I don't spend as many evenings in the law school as I used to. I'm lucky to have an understanding wife; that's the only way I could ever juggle both law school and parenthood. All of the scholar-parents say the responsibilities of children and school can be overwhelming. Yet none would trade their kids but I wouldn't forego their futures. Jo agrees: "Married parents have it easier because they have made escape--a total escape to who demand total attention."