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Vaishnav and Ananthasane Advance to Nationals

contributed by Marcus Thomas

Recently, several Georgia State University College of Law students had the privileged distinction of participating in the Thomas Tang Moot Court Competition. Although the competition is named after the Honorable Thomas Tang, an Asian-American, it is open to all law students. The competition is structured like other Moot Court competitions where participants are given a problem on which they research and prepare a brief. There are four regional competitions and the winners from those regions advanced to the national competition in San Francisco on November 20.

Participants from Georgia State included: Yitz Chien and Gita Surj (winners of “best brief” and second in the “overall” category), Peter Zellif (winner of “best oralist”), and Rupal Vaishnav and Greg Ananthasane (winners of “best overall” and second in the “brief contest” category).

“We prepared for the competition just like writing the brief in RWA,” says Vaishnav. “We were given a problem and we divided the issues among our team members.”

Simply put, the object is to find as many relevant cases of law humanly possible and synthesize them into one concise (twenty-some odd pages) statement for your client. As Vaishnav explains, it wasn’t so simple for his issue. “I had a Civil Liberties Act issue and was looking for case law on the narrow question of, what is permanently residing under color of law?” Since there is very little case law dealing with this issue, he resorted to social sciences and unemployment compensation cases to extract the information he needed. “Where there is little black-letter law on a subject, there is often a lot of room for creative lawyering,” adds Vaishnav.

According to Ananthasane, the biggest challenge was organizing the brief to make a pointed and cohesive argument. He asserts that the RWA experience helped the teams tremendously in this competition.

“As it was, we divided the issues among our team members,” says Greg Ananthasane. “There wasn’t the same structure as Court justices.”

“There wasn’t the same structure as RWA,” claims Ananthasane. “You were free to write the brief in pretty much any format you wanted but it needed to be done in a way that would facilitate a well-structured argument.” He adds, “RWA made me very prepared because most of the work was done on the briefs. Once we compiled our research and papers on our individual issues, we worked for only a couple days on the oral presentation.”

The Southeast regional competition included externs from Georgia State and several from Emory University as well. Most participants agree that the real pressure did not involve dueling the other teams, but rather it was self-imposed. Rupal obviously handled the pressure well but acknowledged that the competition was very close. “We competed against some terrific teams,” says Vaishnav. “In my opinion, the judging could have gone either way.” Vaishnav further explains, “We were the only team d. “I have seen the enemy,” states Ananthasane. “And they are us.” He continues, “I was so nervous that the second sentence that came out my mouth was, can I start over?”

Greg went “off-brief” first and we thought that it would put us at a disadvantage, but it actually helped us to build confidence going into the later rounds.

Rupal and Greg both claim they participated in the Thomas Tang competition instead of Moot Court because it affords them the same exposure and experiences but doesn’t have the two year commitment. Vaishnav also adds, “The competition is so well-respected that the final round was bench by Georgia Supreme Court justices.”

Rupal Vaishnav is a second-year law student who serves as a Senator in SBA and externs with the EPA. He holds a mechanical engineering degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Greg Ananthasane is a second-year law student who works for an immigration attorney and serves as a graduate research assistant for Professor Saito in the College of Law. He holds a political science degree from Emory University.

Ronald Dworkin: 21st Miller Distinguished Lecturer

contributed by Rebecca Barnette and Michael Walker

Ronald Dworkin, University Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford University and Professor of Law at New York University, visited the Law School last week as the 21st Henry J. Miller Distinguished Lecturer.

A legal philosopher of international repute, Dworkin discussed abortion, euthanasia, and genetic engineering in his presentation entitled “Justice, Death, and Luck.” He suggested that while disagreements about these issues are often naturally confined to camps such as “pro-life” and “pro-choice,” the concerns that actually underlie each of the issues are more fundamental. Dworkin contends that there are two primary fundamental concerns: whether individuals should interfere with nature’s patterns (i.e., “play God”) and whether government should play a role in identifying a “correct” answer to the first concern.

Dworkin identified four positions and articulated each position’s approach to the two concerns he initially identified:

Pro-Life: Members who conform to this position insist that it is wrong to “play God.” This group believes that the government should take an active role in not only deciding that abortion, euthanasia, and genetic engineering are immoral but also in proscribing such activities.

Skeptic: Members of the “skeptic” position do not consider interference with nature’s pattern to be a concern. Skeptics contend that nature will run its course regardless of these or any other types of human “interference.” Skeptics’ opinions regarding government action in these areas vary according to unrelated opinions of government’s role in any society.

Humanists: This group counts Prof. Dworkin as one of its own and responds to the first concern by suggesting that it is “probably” not wrong to play God. Dworkin, himself, imagined possible times when interfering with nature could effect good and bad results. Whether good or had, right or wrong, humanists, as the name indicates, believe that government should play no active role in addressing such issues.

Liberals: Members of the final group may disagree as to whether it is wrong to “play God.” But regardless of the answers to that concern, they are in agreement that the government should not take part in the discussion.

After identifying the four positions, Dworkin’s comments relayed his “humanistic” approach to the three issues. He focused many of his comments on genetic engineering, as he considered this to be the great issue of the future and he used the issue to illustrate his thesis: in life there is a fundamental distinction between luck and choice. Examples of luck: physicality, climate, personal talents. Examples of choice: fitness, education. Dworkin suggested that for much of our history there has been a fairly clear demarcation between luck and choice, but when we involve ourselves in genetic engineering we are erasing that line. Dworkin wondered how future generations would live their lives if they eroded the notion of luck in nature and approached life as if it were composed entirely of choices. What choices would they make. Would they try to live forever? If so, how would life be different if extended indefinitely? Would children thank their parents for the genetic choices that predicated their being? Or would they resent them for the choices the parents did not make? If so, would the children believe that they possessed the ability to achieve any unprogrammed quality? Or would they resign themselves to the choices their parents made?

Dworkin suggested that if genetic engineering continues unabated, it could likely lead to a moral “free-fall.” Such “free-falls” have resulted any time humans have been confronted with a significant shift in their understanding of the distinctions between luck and choice. Professor Dworkin concluded by stating the humanistic ideal: it is a part of our nature to struggle with such issues, as it is a part of our nature to push back against the notion of luck and take on more responsibility as creatures capable of making choices.
An Interview with Professor Saito

contributed by Marcia Thomas

When Mr. Patel and I visited the subject of this month's faculty interview, I expected to hear about a lawyer and her legal aspirations. Instead, I listened to an activist describe her social responsibilities.

Nestled among Native American artifacts and a portrait of the honorable Thurgood Marshall, Professor Saito told *the Docker* her story.

**D:** Professor Saito, please tell us about your background and education.

**S:** I was born in Michigan but grew up primarily in Japan. My father is Japanese-American from Washington state, and my mother was white and from south Georgia. I attended an international school in Kobe, Japan and then went to Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania. I moved to Atlanta in 1977 and finished a Master's degree in Education at GSU before going to Yale Law School.

**D:** What made you pursue a legal career?

**S:** Growing up it never crossed my mind to be a lawyer. After I moved to Atlanta, I did community organizing and taught in adult education programs. Eventually, I realized that most of us involved in community-based activism around issues such as housing, public education, and prison conditions knew a lot about the issues, but very little about the legal system that affected them, so I decided to go to law school.

**D:** Can you tell us a little about your human rights law?

**S:** Well, it's not just "be nice to others" kind of law. Typically, it's broken into three major areas: civil and political rights; economic, social, and cultural rights; and an emerging area of the rights of peoples, including the right to self-determination. International law has tended to focus on relationships between sovereign nations; human rights law is developing international standards concerning the treatment of individuals and groups within nations.

**D:** Where does the American lawyer fit into the international arena of human rights?

**S:** There are a lot of opportunities for American lawyers in international human rights law. Not only are there opportunities in the U.S. government and international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of American States, a lot of international human rights work is done by private groups. For example, Amnesty International, the Lawyer's Committee for Human Rights, and the Carter Center, here in Atlanta, are involved in monitoring and reporting on conditions in various countries and in drafting international standards and agreements.

Another possibility is domestic law, using U.S. law and courts to enforce international human rights. For example, the Torture Victim Protection Act gives U.S. courts jurisdiction over certain acts committed overseas by persons now in the United States. Under that statute, the Eleventh Circuit recently considered a case brought by some Ethiopian women who came to the United States and recognized the man who had tortured them in Ethiopia.

**D:** Is it possible for modern law to ever provide an adequate remedy for ancient injustices? How effective is a legal remedy in balancing cultural, social, and religious beliefs?

**S:** Well, the law can't fix everything, and we certainly need means for resolving disputes that are less adversarial than our present system. However, I think it is disingenuous to try and counter legal remedies for social problems by claiming that we can't "legislate morality." We have a long history of legislating morality. The law does not necessarily change people's attitudes, but it does express what kind of conduct is legal.

---

An Interview with the Warrior Queen of the Registrar

contributed by Tom Guzzo

**TJG:** Trish, we have talked a lot in the past, but I know there have been some recent changes. First of all, what is your new job title?

**TR:** My official title is Associate Registrar, but I prefer "Warrior Queen of the Registrar."

**TJG:** So, I suppose you want me to call you "Warrior Queen"?

**TR:** So, I suppose you want to graduate?

**TJG:** Tell me, Oh, Warrior Queen, what do you actually do as the "Warrior Queen of the Registrar"?

**TR:** What other things do you not do?

**TJG:** And, what don't you get involved with?

**TR:** I don't get involved with anything having to do with financial aid or, for that matter, anything having to do with money. All money questions should be directed to Student Accounts or Financial Aid.

**TJG:** Where are they located?

**TR:** They are both located on the first floor of Sparks Hall. Student Accounts is in Room 100. Financial Aid is in Room 102.

**TJG:** What other things do you do?

**TR:** What other things can you recommend for new or graduating students?

**TJG:** Well, basic stuff to remember if you hope to graduate is that you need 90 hours and 36 residency units. You can have no more than 11 pass/fail hours that count toward graduation, and don't forget Legal Bib, which counts as one of them. Also, don't forget about your writing requirement. For new students, I would suggest that they get copies of their transcripts from any previous institution they have attended. We can't give out the copies that we have because we didn't prepare them, and you never know when a potential employer will want to see them.

**TJG:** Well, back to you. How long have you worked at Georgia State?

**TR:** Since 1983. I started in the Pullen Library and worked there for a year or so, which was a really fun job but didn't pay anything. So, I moved to the University Registrar's Office in 1983, where I audited transcripts for two years before moving to the Law School.

**TJG:** What is your educational background?

**TR:** I have a B.A. in Sociology, which gives me official license to stick my nose in everyone's business. Maybe that's why I like this job so much. Also, I was in graduate school for four weeks before deciding I didn't want to do that right then.

**TJG:** What do you do when you are not here?

**TR:** I defend the weak and the downtrodden! No, seriously, I enjoy gardening. I am a gardening maniac. I can bore the socks off people talking about different varieties of tomatoes, peppers and other vegetables. I grew wheat one year and sesame seeds another year. And a variety of corn called "Bloody Butcher." I am a member of Seed Savers Exchange which is a repository for heirloom seeds. I'm also a member of a similar organization for "heirloom" farm animals.

**TJG:** What's an "heirloom farm animal"?

**TR:** Older breeds that have versatile uses. For instance, South Devon cattle are good for milk, meat and work use, and they can forage, which means they need less special food. These animals differ from many modern breeds which require special handling and are good for milking and nothing else.

**TJG:** What else do you like?

**TR:** I love going to dog shows. I don't have a dog but I like to go to shows. I love to watch the agility and obedience trials. What most people don't know is that the dogs that participate don't have to be purebreds.

**TJG:** Interesting. And, didn't you once tell me that you brewed beer?

**TR:** Yes, I brew beer and make wort.

**TJG:** What's wort?

**TR:** It's a fermented mix of honey, water, yeast and spices. Brewing is like having a science experiment. It is delicious if it comes out right. I think I used to make it in a former life.

**TJG:** With all that mead, how do you keep fit?

---

see "Saito" on page 3

see "Queen" on page 4
2019 Jessup Team Named
transfer students make immediate impact

The 1998 Jessup International Moot Court Team has been selected: Mary Hawk (3L), Matthew Kim (2L), Claire Lemme (2L), and Joe Wyant (3L). The team will include Vicki Gross (2L) and David Belleisle (1L).

The team was selected after students competed for positions during two days of arguments earlier this month. The competition required each student to complete some preliminary research related to a topic under international law and engage in oral arguments before a mock international appellate tribunal. The students were benched by GSU professors E.R. Lanier and Charles Marvin and GSU alumnus Andy Lewis, who competed on the Jessup team and who has offered to coach the 1998 team when their rehearsals begin in January.

GSU’s Jessup program is sponsored by the International and Comparative Law Society.


1998 Jessup Moot Court Team:
Mary Hawk, 3L
Matthew Kim, 2L
Claire Lemme, 2L
Joe Wyant, 3L
Alternates:
David Belleisle, 1L
Vicki Gross, 2L

contributed by Michael Walker.

Michael Walker (2L) is fed up with the GSU Office of Financial Aid. “I have yet to experience a positive encounter with the Financial Aid Office, and I think it is time something is done to improve their treatment of law student accounts.” Walker has taken it upon himself to do something about it.

Shortly after the fall semester began, Walker began talking with other students about their financial aid problems. “All summer I was avoided and lied to over and over again by the FAO staff. As I talked to other law students about it, I learned that more and more of them were experiencing the same problems: missing documents that had been properly submitted, unexplained delays, and general incompetence. After a few of these conversations, I decided to take specific action.”

By the beginning of September, Walker had posted flyers around the school inviting students to relay the stories of their financial aid woes so that he could compile the complaints and submit them collectively to College and University officials. “Initially, there was a surge of responses. Then the students began getting him in, with the demands of the semester and had no time to respond. About the same time, their financial aid problems eventually got worse and many students simply forgot about those problems because the funds in their accounts have been spent. In many cases. As a result many students simply let the problems slip their minds.”

Walker urges students not to forget about the problems they have experienced with the Financial Aid Office. “The bigger problem does not go away simply because students eventually get their money. Students who have suffered because of the incompetence at FAO should take a few minutes to convey their stories so that next year things might be a bit better.”

Walker invites all law students who have experienced any difficulties while dealing with the Financial Aid Office — even those whose financial problems have finally been solved — to e-mail an account of the difficulties to him at gswmj@panther.gsu.edu, or leave a message at 404/315.7103. “We already have long accounts and short ones; polite accounts and not so polite accounts. All comments will contribute to the collective effect of this movement.”

If you had troubles dealing with the Office of Financial Aid, speak now or forever hold your peace! Tell your friends about problems, and together we can make a change. Write to gswmj@panther.gsu.edu or call

Page 3
Letter to the Editor:

I am delighted to work for a university that respects and appreciates its role within the community in which it operates. However, when the university sacrifices its primary mission, the education of its tuition-paying students, their safety, and that of those who seek knowledge, the university does a disservice not only to its students, staff, and faculty, but to the community in general. As a state-funded institution of higher learning, we do indeed have an obligation to serve the State of Georgia, both when members of the public impinge upon the learning environment that we seek to provide for our students, our obligation, in each case, reaches its end.

Recently, the College of Law Library has experienced several disturbances involving persons not affiliated with the university, ranging from relatively minor infractions of library policies to an obviously disturbed individual who followed patrons around the library and sang loudly in the stacks to a case of public urination by an inebriated library visitor. One realizes that the location of the library invites problems: half a block away from MARTA, across a parking lot from Grady and the Atlanta Police Department Headquarters. The responses to these occurrences from certain members of the campus police have been less than encouraging. While unacceptable library behavior is not, in and of itself, a life or death issue, when it adversely affects the learning environment on a university campus, it is a criminal offense, namely trespassing. As law students, your conduct in the law library is governed by the Honor Code. (Once again, no food in the library!) While the general public cannot be held to the same standards as law students, when their behavior interferes with our students’ ability to effectively use the law library, they can be and are asked to leave.

Contrary to popular sentiment, while the libraries on campus are a part of a publicly funded institution, they are not public libraries. As a librarian, no one is more concerned with the rights of all people to have access to information. The cornerstone of our profession is the idea that access to information be made available to all. The concept of access to information for all does not mean, however, that everyone should be granted access to every library. This is the reason why public libraries were founded: so that every member of society would have assured access to books and other tools of learning. University libraries were designed to enrich the intellectual life of the academic communities which they serve. Georgia State University provides a public service by allowing the public access to its libraries, but, once again, we are not public libraries. While granting the public access to university facilities is admirable, any behavior which hinders the learning process of our students, especially those not affiliated with the university, is unacceptable and should not be tolerated by anyone at the university, especially those who are hired to “serve and protect.”

Some may make the argument that as selective participants in the federal government documents depository program, we are obligated to give the general public access to all of our resources. We are, in fact, only required by law to give general public access to the government documents contained within our collection. (In the case of the College of Law Library, government documents materials account for only about five percent of the total collection, and due to the intershelving of government documents, the general public is granted access to the collection without borrowing rights.) Creating a learning environment which is conducive to higher thought and the acquisition of knowledge is our raison d’etre. When there is a disturbance in the library, or anywhere on campus, one expects campus police to address the interests of the university, not to give excuses about public buildings. The tax payers have the right to expect GSU to provide the citizens of Georgia with a first-class education. The general public, however, does not have the right to encroach upon the learning environment of our students — no one does, be it fellow students, faculty, staff, or GSU police. We have been assured that recent incidents were aberrations and not university policy. In those rare cases in which the goals of the university come into conflict with one another, i.e., serving students versus serving the general public, let us hope the reason for our existence will be upheld first and foremost.

Edna S. Dixon
Catalog Librarian
College of Law Library

If you have something to say about the goings-on around the College of Law, the University, the city, the state, the nation, the world, or even the cosmos, let us hear about it!

Letters to the Editor are always welcomed. Submit your comments to the Docket via the addresses below.

"Queen" continued from page 2

WQ: I go on urban hikes. I love urban hikes - just taking long walks in the city, especially a city like Atlanta, can be a great way to get some exercise, and relax. Hiking in the mountains is fun, too, but I don't get there too often.

TJG: You haven't mentioned that you are a fan of Xena, the Warrior Princess?

WQ: Yes, I am. But I prefer talking about Babylon 5.

TJG: Speaking of "talking", you always seem to have someone in here. You must like us law students.

WQ: Very much! I see the L1's come in the first year, and some are very much intimidated. It's a stressful time. I like to offer a place where they can come in to resolve some of the confusion and maybe relax for a few minutes. If in the process we get to talking about this and then, that then OK. We are here to help.

TJG: In a recent issue of the DOCKET, a good friend of mine wrote an article about the new spirit in the school toward "customer service".

WQ: That's kinda' the way I feel, but I don't get there too often.

TJG: Hence your reference to the "weak and the downtrodden"?

WQ: Smart ass! Wanna see your grades disappear from the computer?

TJG: Well, I guess I better wrap this up. Thanks for your time and your friendship over the past few years. You've made law school a little easier for me, and I wanted the new students to get to know you early on. When I leave school should I get a penname?

WQ: Do you want your name spelled correctly on your diploma?
Opinion: The Easy Way into Law School

Why did we do it? Why did we commit ourselves to years of academic struggle? and humbly ask virtual strangers for recommendations? and spend hundreds of dollars and hours preparing for the LSAT? and spend hundreds of dollars and hours applying to law schools across the country? and spend months waiting for acceptance/denial notices? and expose ourselves to the evil horrors of financial aid? Why did we do these things? Why did we take the long, hard road to the GSU College of Law, when there was such an easier way?

The prudent law student knows—now that it is too late; now that eradition and a sound work ethic have stained her thoroughly, never to be washed away—that there is an easier way to receive an official invitation to hallowed halls of our academic island floating in a sea of urban sprawl. This alternate path, trodden upon by more and more these days, is not without its own unique obstacles though. So, for the benefit of law school applicants and to introduce these noble personages to those present students who don’t spend many waking hours in the library (you if: (a) you study at home, or (b) you sleep in the library), the following are some of the prerequisites to qualification for what is referred to as “Fast-Crack” admittance:

First, you must be homeless. Homeless people have a unique need from the law school: shelter. This need warrants immediate attention from University officials. The traditional law student deserves no such attention, for she is better equipped for the longer delays of traditional acceptance notification because, quite simply, she has some place to sit while one eventuates from your home due to delinquency resulting from delayed financial aid funding does not satisfy the homeless requirement; quite the opposite, it further cements “traditional” status.) To the chance reader who intends to apply to this law school, does the above paragraph mean that you were homeless? Should you think such minds were confined to the past—know better. There is an easier way to achieve excellence, or, if you they command the protection of campus police?

Second, you must be truly excellent. The traditional law student spent a lifetime searching out a niche for herself, compiling a list of achievements and awards that might quantify her uniqueness among a field of over-qualified combatants. The fast-crack student knows better. There is an easier way to achieve excellence, or, if you will, to stand-out: don’t bathe. Even the scores of traditional law students pensively pacing the law library in hopeless efforts to excell beyond their classmates slow down to take notice of the special air emanating from the fast-crack student. This aura is beyond any simple description. One must experience it first hand to truly appreciate its...excellence.

Third, your thoughts must be so expansive in their greatness that you cannot contain them. Put another way: you must talk to yourself. This activity, behavioralists say, demonstrates an exceptional ability to think and, therefore, exist outside of and in disregard to the “rules” of polite society. Surely, the traditional law student spent many a votive hour studying with envy the eccentric geniuses of history, who couldn’t quite conform to society’s petty demands. Those who thought such minds were confined to the past should now appreciate that comparable minds presently teem in this city, oblivious to all at MARTA stations, in parking decks, and now in the law library. It is an exercise in futility to attempt communication with minds of such brilliance; though, if lucky, one might comprehend a phrase or two. I’m not altogether sure, but I think I once heard one say something that sounded like: spare change.

Fourth, you must possess an extraordinary spirit. While the traditional law student looks to elitest sources like religion and philosophy for inspiration, the fast-crack student finds his spirit in more proletarian places: bottles and cans, pipes and spoons. It makes sense, really—but then minds of this calibre are expected to establish what is sensical—to employ such disposable sources of spirit: they can be readily attained and are easily replaced. The fast-crack student is impressively able to rejuvenate his spirit on a dime (or, perhaps, a quarter for those really tough days) before entering the law school bursting with energy and emotion. The traditional law student, lacking extraordinary abilities, finds his spirit in the trail blazers described above: theirs is surely the way of the future. To the majority of current law students, those of you who struggle predictably to enjoy “traditional” status, admire the fast-crack students, for they are the pride of the school. Why else would they command the protection of campus police?

Michael Walker

Editorial: Bar Results Could Hinder Our Reputation

GSU College of Law has always been proud of its immaculate record in Bar passage rates. For a school less than fifteen years old, we have achieved tremendous feats in terms of academic excellence. We ranked ahead of schools like Emory, UGA, and Mercer. We have been first among Georgia law schools in Bar passage rates, but not this year.

This year GSU College of Law is behind Emory, UGA, and Mercer. The only school we beat in Atlanta was John Marshall. Cause for concern? You bet! The question is did we have a bad day or has the new exam format thrown us off completely. And if we were thrown off, why? Did we not study hard enough? Did we study too hard and not get enough sleep? What did we do differently? What did we do better?

While the atmosphere of law school breeds competitive and adversarial attitudes among fellow law students, we can not ignore our responsibility to our fellow students in realizing our goals. The goal for most students in law schools is finding a job at the end of their law school career. This year GSU College of Law is behind Emory, UGA, and Mercer. The only school we beat in Atlanta was John Marshall. Cause for concern? You bet! The question is did we have a bad day or has the new exam format thrown us off completely. And if we were thrown off, why? Did we not study hard enough? Did we study too hard and not get enough sleep? What did we do differently? What did we do better?

The only school we beat in Atlanta was John Marshall. Cause for concern? You bet! The question is did we have a bad day or has the new exam format thrown us off completely. And if we were thrown off, why? Did we not study hard enough? Did we study too hard and not get enough sleep? What did we do differently? What did we do better?

Farewell Friends...

Michael Walker

“Jussup” continued from page 3

GSU College of Law has always been proud of its immaculate record in Bar passage rates. For a school less than fifteen years old, we have achieved tremendous feats in terms of academic excellence. We ranked ahead of schools like Emory, UGA, and Mercer. We have been first among Georgia law schools in Bar passage rates, but not this year.

This year GSU College of Law is behind Emory, UGA, and Mercer. The only school we beat in Atlanta was John Marshall. Cause for concern? You bet! The question is did we have a bad day or has the new exam format thrown us off completely. And if we were thrown off, why? Did we not study hard enough? Did we study too hard and not get enough sleep? What did we do differently? What did we do better?

While the atmosphere of law school breeds competitive and adversarial attitudes among fellow law students, we can not ignore our responsibility to our fellow students in realizing our goals. The goal for most students in law schools is finding a job at the end of their law school career. Attaining a good job depends not only on your grades but also on the reputation of your law school. Recently, I applied for a job in Washington D.C., and was told that “coming out of Georgia State University, our threshold cut off is top 5%.” Thus, we need to concentrate on building a good reputation for this school if we want to be recognized anywhere.

Recognition of our school name outside of Georgia is a distant goal but we are close to losing credibility even in Georgia if we don’t get back on the path of greater school recognition.

— Kirtan Patel, Editor

Farewell Friends....

At 3 graduate from GSU College of Law. I have with fond memories and friends for life. My experience as a law student has enriched me in many ways but most importantly, I am richer by my relationships both with the students and the faculty. The law school community has carried me through rough times in life and has encouraged me to do better at all times. Thank you very much.

I wish all of you the very best in every aspect of life and please enjoy life even during law school.

- Kirtan Patel

"Jussup" continued from page 3

combine my interest in French with a career in law, I would be in heaven."

After graduating from Agnes Scott, Claire wanted to stay in Atlanta: "If fell in love with Atlanta the moment I walked from a MARTA station and looked around. It is the best of both worlds — friendly, like Louisvile, cosmopolitan like St. Louis." She worked in the area for nearly three years before beginning law school at Washington University, five miles from her parents.

Claire's reason for transferring to GSU: "I have found that studying law is about you, a book, and Mr. Coffee. The coffee and the books are the same everywhere, but I am much happier in Atlanta. There are people I care about here, and the job market is strong." Why GSU instead of other area schools? "I was also accepted to Emory, which has a fine program; but I don't believe that paying an extra $20,000 a year is going to make me a better lawyer. What will make me a better lawyer is the sophisticated level of discussion at GSU, furthered by the diverse group of students and faculty that contribute to this community.

— Kirtan Patel
contributed by: Roger Futerman

Let me begin by congratulating Cita Surjaya, Rapul Vasudavan, Vijendra Verma, and Amanbhu Verma who qualified for the Thomas Tang National Moot Court Competition. I would also like to congratulate Shi Ji Morokuma and Judy Lam who so finelly hosted and organized the competition. It was an all around success. Let us wish the competitors well in San Francisco.

Also let me congratulate all participants of the Jessup International Moot Court try-outs. With the help of experts like Professor Marvin, and Professor Lanier we are sure the team will build on the success of the previous teams.

I would also like to congratulate BLSA, for being active in hosting student events and coming up with new ideas to keep students involved. BLSA hosted a candlelight vigil to focus attention on police brutality. As a participant I thought this was a valid cause and one students should always keep monitoring. It is this attentiveness that will help diminish the present reputation of this law school. I think that is one of the main goals of this year’s BSA Board.

WHAT HAS THE BSA BOARD DONE THIS MONTH?

1. We hosted the inaugural staff appreciation luncheon; (a tradition that I sincerely hope next year’s Board continues).


3. Produced, with the kind sponsorship of PMBR, the Student Directory complete with e-mail addresses.

4. Provided food for, and introduced students to potential board members at a night and day open forum “come meet the candidates”.

5. Swore in the new Board members.

6. Held a design-a-logo sweatshirt contest and passed a motion to purchase 100 sweat shirts with the new design.

7. Passed a motion for the “feed the homeless” SBA food drive.

8. Funded members of CLS and GALS to attend National Conventions.

9. Approved funding for the four competitors to attend the National Thomas Tang Competition.

10. Passed a motion to hold a question and answer review exam session, where the SBA will once again provide Bliemite subs and refreshments in the last week of October.

I am looking forward to further student activities and participation.

Federalist Society Hosts

Randall Barnett

contributed by Michael Walker and Johnny Lee

Professor Randy Barnett, the Austin B. Fletcher Professor at Boston University School of Law, was the invited speaker at the October Federalist Society meeting. Barnett, discussing the Second Amendment, spoke primarily in support of the notion that the right to bear arms is an individual right on par with any other individual rights enumerated in the Constitution. Throughout his address Professor Barnett emphasized the crucial similarities between a citizen’s right to bear arms and other individual rights such as freedom of expression.

To buttress his position, Barnett beckoned a litany of historical references to the Second Amendment. During the current tries to land that perfect job:

http://www.lexonline.com/ Legal Employment Marketplace. Has job listings and even a special selection for law students, and lawyer jokes too!


http://www.lawinfo.com/employment/ Lawinfo Employment Center. Let's you make a resume or post one you have.

http://www.hq.org/employment.html Hieros Gamon Legal Employment Center. It boasts to be the largest source of jobs on the internet. Has links to other employment sites.

http://seamless.seamless.com/80/jobs/ =The Seamless Web Legal. You can look for a job, look for an employee or explore the discussion area.

http://www.lexis-nexis.com/lace/about/employment/employment.html LEXIS-NEXIS Employment Center, enough said. Also available is a design-a-logo sweatshirt contest and passed a motion to purchase 100 sweat shirts with the new design.

I am looking forward to further student activities and participation.

CALS Offers Help to Job Hunters

contributed by George Waters

Computers and the Law Society (CALS) is a relatively new organization on campus. It was started last year and Professor Wiseman is the faculty advisor. The mission of CALS is to promote the use of computers in the profession of law and to educate others in the ways computers can assist lawyers. If anyone is interested in joining CALS or assisting the organization please contact George Waters at georgewaters@mindspring.com. I would like to address something that for many of us will certainly help us in being a lawyer – getting a job. The following are a list of web sites devoted to jobs in the legal profession and are as good as any place to land that perfect job:

http://www.lexonline.com/ Legal Employment Marketplace. Has job listings and even a special selection for law students, and lawyer jokes too!


http://www.lawinfo.com/employment/ Lawinfo Employment Center. Let's you make a resume or post one you have.

http://www.hq.org/employment.html Hieros Gamon Legal Employment Center. It boasts to be the largest source of jobs on the internet. Has links to other employment sites.

http://seamless.seamless.com/80/jobs/ =The Seamless Web Legal. You can look for a job, look for an employee or explore the discussion area.

http://www.lexis-nexis.com/lace/about/employment/employment.html LEXIS-NEXIS Employment Center, enough said. Also


http://www.jobsite.co.uk/ In case anyone wants to work in the United Kingdom


http://ftplaw.wuacc.edu/jobpro/ lawjobs-lthreads.html LawJobs. An E-mail Thread Index.


http://www.verblegal.com/ Another one. Have to register here, though.


http://www.pingsite.com/integra/ inlegal. html Integro Legal

http://www.lawschool.com/ Career Center


http://www.law.wumich.edu/academic/ opps/ Public Service JobNet by the University of Michigan.

Look for more listings in future editions of the Docket. Until then, happy job hunting!
contributed by: Dorsey Hopson

On Sunday, November 2, 1997, a battle took place between some of our fellow students. No, it wasn't a bar room brawl or a battle in the courtroom. This battle took place on the football field. The Law Dawgs, who are coming off of a season that featured a game short of winning the championship, is composed of a group of 3LS. Panther Law is composed of 1Ls. These two teams battled it out to determine which "law" ruled at the Gus Anderson. The match up was highly anticipated. The Law Dawgs came into the game with a record of 2-1. Their only defeat was suffered at the hands of Amigo (the team who beat them in the championship the previous year). The hot, young, Panther Law came into the game with an undefeated and league-best record of 3-0.

Game after game, week after week, Panther Law dominated its opponents. Understandably, before the game, there was a lot of pregame hype. The Law Dawgs were eager to play the up and coming Panther Law. The Law Dawgs believed that their experience from the previous year would enable them to emerge victorious. Panther Law, on the other hand, believed that their youth, skill, and athleticism would be enough to snatch victory from the jaws of the Law Dawgs.

From the moment of the kickoff, the atmosphere was intense and you could just feel the competitive spirit in the air. The Law Dawgs won the toss and elected to receive the ball. Panther Law's defense was stingy and aggressive and they forced the Law Dawgs to punt from their end zone after only 3 plays. Panther Law received the punt and marched down the field like a team possessed with a series of runs and short passes. Within minutes, Panther Law scored the game's first touchdown! The Law Dawgs looked bewildered and confused, however, they quickly regained their composure and stopped the extra point and the Panther Law lead 6 to 0.

The Law Dawgs took possession again. They were able to move the ball and get a first down. But then, that stingy Panther Law defense reared its head once again. The Law Dawgs were forced to punt for a second time in two possessions. Panther Law received the ball and began their second offensive possession. Only this time, the Law Dawgs made a few adjustments and started to show off that defense that carried them into the championship the previous year. After a couple of plays, the Law Dawgs got an interception and returned the ball to Panther Law's 25 yard line. Panther Law shook their heads in disbelief. Then, the rejuvenated Law Dawgs offense went to work. After a successful run play, the Law Dawgs threw a pass to one of its receivers. The receiver dove for the end zone but he came up short. On third down, the Law Dawgs went to the option and scored a touchdown to tie the score with the clock running down. Panther Law stopped the extra point and the half ended with a score of 6 to 6.

The second half was just as entertaining and even more dramatic. Panther Law received the ball on the kickoff. The Law Dawgs' defense was unriveling. After giving up one first down, the Law Dawgs forced another punt. Panther Law's defense was up to the challenge and forced a punt by the Law Dawgs. Panther Law received the ball and started its second drive of the second half. After a couple of plays of minimal gain, the Law Dawgs defense struck again. A member of the Law Dawgs intercepted a pass and gave the Law Dawgs a great field position. Again, Panther Law's defense was up to the task. Panther Law forced the Law Dawgs to make a fourth down decision. Boldly, yet swiftly, the Law Dawgs decided to go for it. As the crowd looked on the quarterback threw a pass to a wide open Andrew Surdykowski. It was good for the first down and it moved the Law Dawgs into the red zone. Three plays later, Surdykowski, as he is affectionately known, caught the go ahead touchdown. The Law Dawgs went wild with celebration. Panther Law dropped their heads. The Law Dawgs decided to go for two.

On a quarterback keeper to the left, they were successful and the new score was Panther Law 6 -- Law Dawgs 14!

The fired up Law Dawgs defense caused havoc and disrupted the Panther Law offense. Within four plays, Panther Law was forced to decide whether to punt or go for it. The decision was to punt. With less than 4 minutes left, the Law Dawgs had the ball again. On their first play, the Law Dawgs got a first down, the defense stiffened. They held the Dawgs to no gain on the next play and then called time out. They held the Dawgs to a minimal gain on the next play, and called timeout again. In an effort to run the clock out the Dawg's quarterback ran around the backfield until someone pulled his flag. The clock continued to run and the Dawgs punted.

Panther Law received the ball with 56 seconds to play and no timeouts. They quickly began marching down field. On the last play of regulation, Panther Law were able to score a touchdown! That made the score 14 to 12. Panther Law went for 2 hoping to force an overtime. On the two point conversion, the Law Dawgs got an interception and raced 80 yards the other way, ending any and all hope for Panther Law. The final score was Law Dawgs 16 Panther Law 12.

The Law Dawgs did their talking on the field. In the words of a late great sportsman "It was a great game but someone had to lose." Unfortunately for the 1Ls of Panther Law, that someone was them.

As a side note, the game showed how fun, competitive, and useful the GSU recreation department can be. With exams coming up, I think Panther Law paid for all of the pregame trash talk.

THE MOOT COURT BOARD MINUTES: We Win, Again.

contributed by: Chris Chan, Moot Court President

The Moot Court Board will complete the process of selecting new candidates by November 17. The results of the Appellate Advocacy class oral arguments will be added to the scores received for the briefs written earlier this fall to determine the new candidates.

This year’s briefs and arguments were based upon First and Fourteenth Amendment issues presented in a case factually similar to the Bowers and Shahar controversy, recently heard en banc by the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. Over 60 full-time and part-time students participated in the Appellate Advocacy program. Congratulations to Michelle Whitelaw and her committee members for their efforts thus far.

An update on our two teams in national competitions: The National Moot Court Competition team composed of Veronica Hoffler, Larry Koehn, Lance LoRusso, and coach Beverly Whitelaw is preparing for regional oral argument competition in Atlanta on November 21. And the National Information and Privacy Moot Court Competition team composed of Shukara Ingram, Jay Shreenath, Devon Lodge-Atchison, and coach Jack Hawkins will have already competed October 22-23 in Chicago, IL. In the Spring of 1998, Moot Court Board teams will compete in the Saul Lefkowitz Trademark Competition, the Wagner Memorial Labor Law Competition, the Georgia Intrastate Competition, and the ABA National Moot Court Competition. Good luck to all of our teams!

Finally, in the final inning of the Dean’s Cup softball game, the Moot Court Board defeated Law Review, 9-7. The offense and defense handed a loss to an overmatched Law Review team, bringing home a second victory in the last eight months. We welcome the next challenge!
The Student Bar Association cordially invites you to

The 1997 Winter Holiday Party

at Otto’s of Buckhead

on December 20, at 7:00 p.m.

Celebrate the end of the semester with your law school community.

§ A hot and cold buffet will be served including turkey, lamb, salmon and 12 other food items. There will be a D.J., an assortment of music, and a cash bar.

§ A raffle will occur with great prizes including a magnum of champagne.

§ Tickets will only be $5 per person, but will be limited to the first 140 people. Tickets will be available from all SBA Board Members and the Docket Staff.