by Sally Schall and Joe Taylor

And we wonder why the axiom of the day is "If you don't want to get involved, I'm not fond of throwing myself out to the wolves or beginning
my sentences with 'and', but certain events have prompted me to lose caution to the wind. I earnestly hope
that Joe and I will not be zapped with the threat of a lawsuit for our stance on this issue. If we are, at least we
will have the small consolation of knowing that the action we took was of our own volition.

Our Honor Court Presenters were recently presented with a burden by which they did not sign a document stating that Allison Nichol, a first year student, was the victim of "blatant untruths" in the recent Honor Court investigation of allegations made fol­

Astonished at such a
discovery to their dismay, that had they spent five months writing a script instead of preparing a civil trial, they
should never go

to sign the statement! Granted, this is precisely the reason Ms. Nichol and her attorney were banking on - it doesn't take a finely honed legal mind to reach such a conclusion. However, it
is a gross absurdity that these presenters should have to bow to such pressure when they were starting to the procedures we have all implicitly consented to support by enrolling in this institution.

Until the Honor Code policy is officially changed, we have no right to alter procedures or fail to comply with its provisions. The presenters ob­

ustiously nature to arrest - and this

The five months we spent learning

The faculty and administration's hands-off policy in regard to the recurring Honor Code problems should end with this incident. It is obvious that we are no longer capable of policing ourselves. Imagine the situation had the presenters refused to sign the statement! Granted, this is precisely the reason Ms. Nichol and her attorneys were banking on - it doesn't take a finely honed legal mind to reach such a conclusion. However, it is a gross absurdity that these presenters should have to bow to such pressure when they were starting to the procedures we have all implicitly consented to support by enrolling in this institution.

Until the Honor Code policy is officially changed, we have no right to alter procedures or fail to comply with its provisions. The presenters ob­

The philosophy behind the Honor Code is that of students policing their peers, not the faculty. Students have the right to sign the statement! Granted, this is precisely the reason Ms. Nichol and her attorneys were banking on - it doesn't take a finely honed legal mind to reach such a conclusion. However, it is a gross absurdity that these presenters should have to bow to such pressure when they were starting to the procedures we have all implicitly consented to support by enrolling in this institution.

Until the Honor Code policy is officially changed, we have no right to alter procedures or fail to comply with its provisions. The presenters ob­
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The philosophy behind the Honor Code is that of students policing their peers, not the faculty. Students have the right to sign the statement! Granted, this is precisely the reason Ms. Nichol and her attorneys were banking on - it doesn't take a finely honed legal mind to reach such a conclusion. However, it is a gross absurdity that these presenters should have to bow to such pressure when they were starting to the procedures we have all implicitly consented to support by enrolling in this institution.
To the Editor:

I'm sorry, you are no longer eligible for a Guaranteed Student Loan. We are sorry but there is no more financial aid available. To the law student this two sentences contain facts that would virtually end a law career. Unfortunately this is notlessly, not all students will be affected by a change in GSL eligibility or in the limited resources to be found in the financial aid sector, but there is a large class of students who will be affected. As I happen to be in this affected class, my primary concern has become whether I will be able to continue law school or drop out because I will not be able to afford the tuition.

A recent Chicago Tribune article reported President Reagan's advice to students affected by cuts in financial aid. The President's advice was that students work to earn their way through school. What about those already working but still not earning enough? The President's answer was to work harder. What a relief! I have a job as a legal intern. The salary from that job coupled with some financial aid just might get me through my last year.

Perhaps a clerking job will help me and others in my situation to afford law school. Ironically enough, Valpo has a rather dim view of student clerking. The policy behind this view is rather obscure, but it manifests itself in at least two ways. First is the administration's interpretation of the Indiana Student Practice Rules. Valpo says to be certified you must be enrolled in the clinic course. No other legal aid in Indiana interprets the rule in a way which requires enrollment in a clinic course. If a law student has the chance to gain practical experience while getting paid for it why must he or she also enroll in clinic? A job, class, plus clinic would use up more hours than there are in a day. Something would have to give. For those like I who can not do without a job, clinic would have to go and along with clinic, certification, and along with certification goes any hope of gaining practical experience.

"I will not tolerate any choice between job and school." This is the second way in which the anti- clerking policy manifests itself. It is a complete intolerance that some professors have to any and all possible conflicts that might arise between a job and school activities. Admittedly proponents of the view have a reasonable argument in that a student's primary purpose in law school is to go to class. I agree totally. But this argument should not apply with the same force to conflicts which arise that do not involve time devoted to class. The trouble is that the intolerant view does not differentiate between scheduled class time and out of class time. Under this view the job is secondary at all times and in all circumstances. What happens when to stay in school one needs a job? What has priority then? School or job? A policy which has absolute intolerance to these considerations is itself unfair and unjust.

Law School does not operate in a vacuum. Clerking jobs are no longer a luxury, they have become a necessity for some. Whatever the reasons that once existed behind Valpo's clerking policy, they are now obsolete and unfair when compared to the present economic situation. It is time they were changed.

by Scott Duerring

Take Advantage of Law Week

When Spring Break ends, Valpa­
raise University School of Law stu­
dents will be faced with another law week. Unfortunately, attendance was poor at most of the scheduled events, even though the quality of the speakers, etc. was high. Popular though at that time attributed the poor attendance to lack of enthusiasm and lack of money. This year's calendar of events looks better than ever. Delta Theta Phi has brought in a very popular speaker to debate corporate accountability with some corporate big-wigs. Phi Alpha Delta and BALSA plan to bring in a noted Indiana attorney to VUSL to discuss the bar exam and the Latino student practice rules. Valpo says to be certified you must be enrolled in the clinic course. No other legal aid in Indiana interprets the rule in a way which requires enrollment in a clinic course. If a law

bargain, no matter what the price. Finally, the annual Barrister's Ball, held in its usual place, should be better, too. The reason is that this year, the SBA has promised to get a real band - one that plays songs we know and love. Also, most of the faculty has expressed interest in the Ball. It will be a welcome change to be able to socialize with the faculty (and the rest of the student body, for that matter, in the light of the infrequent SBA bashes).

The point of all this is to build some enthusiasm for Law Week. Let's all take advantage of what is being offered. Let's put our studies on the back burner for a day or two and enjoy life.

With a new law building in the offering it is especially important that we show support for our school to watchful alumni and potential back­
ers. If we aren't enthusiastic about activities here, no one else will be, and there's reason to be enthusiastic - Law Week offers something for every­

case. Let's put our studies on the back burner for a day or two and enjoy life.

Those Evil Doctors

Dear Editor,

Sure an' there must be some powerful fearless hobnobs, green­
lines, spokes and betes-noires, that the administration has wisely seen fit to always keep the east entrance to Wesemann Hall locked. The Good Lord knows what all manner of Satanic slime and wholes of the Devil might sink in on the heels of poor, freezing law students. And good thing it be, too, that the likes of 'em wouldn't think to come in by the north or west entrance! So, a brace of 'cheers', straight from the Bronx, for those responsible for keeping that door locked!

(To the fingers to those students - probably all 1-L's - who, finding the door negligently left ajar, enter and allow the door to slam shut and lock again!)

Tu-El

Cheers And Jeers

To every organization planning some sort of presentation during Law Week. Maybe VUSL is a real law school after all.

JEERS - To the SBA for having a party at a club that closes at midnight. CHEERS - To the SBA for finally acknowledging that there is a noise problem in the library. It's about time.

JEERS - To the SBA for finally sponsoring another party. Too bad the beer ran out.

JEERS - To the University Adminis­
tration for allowing ONE to ream the University. The University's cowardly

stance on the pay phone issue is typical of many University positions. Let's hope provsiiions are made for the new law building to have a tele­

phone hook-up with the rest of the world.

CHEERS - To the new seminar room interior decorator, whose artistry honoreed Prof. Cox and his infamous pacing - and cheers to the prof, for being the good sport that he is.
To the Editor

This letter was prompted by the recent actions (or inactions) taken by the Readmissions Committee of the faculty. The committee is made up of four faculty members and one SBA appointed student member. It screens petitions for readmission of students who are adjudged academically deficient.

The committee may decide to readmit the student. If the vote is 5-0 or 4-1 in the student's favor, he is readmitted. Any other committee vote is subject to faculty review, upon a 60 per cent majority to rehear the petition. In that case, the committee's vote is vacated and the student's petition is heard de novo. A vote by the faculty is final. If the faculty decides not to hear the petition, the committee's decision is final.

I do not mean to say that only one, adjective fully and completely describes the decisions of the Readmissions Committee. The adjective, therefore, is arbitrary. As far as I can tell, the adjective that best describes the decisions of the Readmissions Committee is "arbitrary." The committee may decide to readmit the student. The committee is made up of four faculty members and one appointed student member. It screens petitions for readmission of students who are adjudged academically deficient. The committee may decide to readmit the student. If the vote is 5-0 or 4-1 in the student's favor, he is readmitted. Any other committee vote is subject to faculty review, upon a 60 per cent majority to rehear the petition. In that case, the committee's vote is vacated and the student's petition is heard de novo. A vote by the faculty is final. If the faculty decides not to hear the petition, the committee's decision is final.
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VU CARES

by Beth Daush

"Luckily I just injured him," Laurie Sandlin, now 36, said. Her father was, and is, an alcoholic. "Up until 10 years ago he thought he fell and shot himself," she added. Laurie's brother also became an alcoholic; her sister pushed drugs; and at various stages of Laurie's life she was hooked on speed, married to an alcoholic and attempting suicide.

Sandlin's story was one of several recounted during an "Alcohol Awareness" meeting held Wednesday and Thursday of last week. Those were just a few of the events during "Alcoholic Awareness Week," and sponsored by a newly founded campus organization called VU Care: the Valparaiso University Counseling and Alcohol Responsibility and Education. VU Care is made up of Valpo students, many of whom have been faced with alcoholic problems in their own lives.

Care believes that people must become knowledgeable in this widespread problem in order to deal with the disease intelligently. Also, because it has been determined that 80 percent of college students drink and one out of ten of these people have a problem with this drug, people must become aware of the problem and where one can get help is awareness week.

"I've been in Al Anon for 12 years and it saved my life," Peg Weinhold, whose husband is a recovered alcoholic and former VU professor, said. "I learned acceptance through Al Anon. I learned that I can only live my own life, and try to be more understanding and accepting of every other human being."

Perhaps the saddest point about problem drinkers is the torment their families must endure during their sickness. "The whole family becomes sick," said Dr. Brice Rohrer, a reformed alcoholic and drug user, and added, "They cannot be unaffected... The unenduring victims deserve some help too.

Disillusionment becomes another problem with alcohol and "each of us thinks we're the exception because we're different. None of us are immune," said Dannison.

Another problem with alcoholism is that people do not realize that it is a holie and former VU professor, said. "I learned acceptance through Al Anon. I learned that I can only live my own life, and try to be more understanding and accepting of every other human being."

Along with becoming familiar with a problem drinkers believe they can do anything to you, you are already blinded by the drug. The next step is to help them recognize the problems right here on campus," VU Care member Jackie Stone said at the meeting. "We're here to offer any support for anyone who needs it."

Once the problem is acknowledged, there are steps one can take to deal with, leaving the real problem being the acceptance of the disease. If you don't think you are doing anything to you, you are already blinded by the drug. The next step is to help them recognize the problems right here on campus," said Dave Dannison a counselor on the problem at the Michigan City Care Unit of Michigan City Hospital. Alcohol is a drug that is the third largest cause of death in the United States. There are many organizations that are willing to help anyone that asks for it. Becoming aware of the problem and where one can get help is VU CARE's main objective in their awareness week.

Sandlin, who is now a substance abuse counselor at Porter-Starke Services, Inc., attributes her success to 10 years of therapy, the most beneficial of which was Alcoholics Anonymous. Testimonials of such success continued throughout the lectures.

Mock Trial

continued from page one

trial required a tremendous amount of time and effort, but the end result and experience has proven invaluable.

"It was definitely a good experience," was the reaction of team member, Mike Trowell. Mike also said, "Being on the team was a good exercise in how to lose. I am disappointed for Prof. Stevenson as much as I am for myself. I also learned never to be a 'country bumpkin' in the future."

Many individuals helped the team prepare throughout the year by participating as witnesses and judges. Those on the team extend their deep appreciation to all those who helped.

GUILD SERVES VALPO

The Valparaiso Guild, with members from all over the United States, visited the University this past weekend for their 50th Spring Convention. The Guild's main priority is to support the work of this Christian university by donating money for whatever is needed in the future. Over the years the Guild has built Guild Hall, lecture hall in Bell Science Center and the Brandt Campanile Bells by the chapel. To this date the Guild has donated nearly $3 million to the University.

At this time the Guild is working to raise the money pledged for six racquetball courts to be built in the new Hilltop Sports Complex Center. The Guild has an ongoing commitment to keep high the quality of students and faculty at Valparaiso University. By giving money for financial aid, the Guild believes that along with Valparaiso's solid standing in the academic world, the University will be able to compete for top quality students, and keep the superior staff which Valparaiso has grown accustomed to.

WHY ARE YOU LATE AGAIN FOR CLASS

THE ROADS WERE UNFORESEABLY TREACHEROUS.

Zzz! Wood v. Boynton! 
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION
ACT! Sherwood! Zzzz!

PSYCHE he used to DREAM about me.
REAL ESTATE PRACTICE INSTITUTE

By Joe Taylor

The Valparaiso University School of Law will be host to a two day institute on Real Estate Practice in Indiana on March 11 and 12. The institute, sponsored by VUSL, the VUSL Alumni Association, the Indiana State Bar Association, and the Indiana Continuing Legal Education Forum (ICLIF), will be held in the Great Hall located in the student union.

The institute was developed to acquaint lawyers with new techniques and innovative concepts used in the practice of real estate law. Recent restriction on financing, federal subdivision controls, and other federal rules, recent case law and the new tax cut have made complex even the most routine transactions. Safeguards and preventive strategies will be presented to help overcome the traps and pitfalls that await the uninformed practitioner.

The panel of the ICLIF institute is composed of fifteen of Indiana's most respected professors, counselors, and appellate court judges. VUSL students will recognize most of the panel members, in particular, Prof. Charles Cromley, Prof. Bruce Berner, Assoc. Dean Farago, Adjunct Prof. Alan S. Morrison, Jack Lawson, Hon. Robert Staton, Hon. Wesley Ratliff, Jr. and Prof. Douglas Kmiec of Notre Dame. All VUSL students are encouraged to attend this institute. More information concerning this worthy event can be found on Nancy's bulletin board by those who wish to attend.

MONDAY MARCH 29:
WLSA Presentation - Employment discrimination.

TUESDAY MARCH 30:
DTP - At 9 am in the Courtroom, Eugene G. Chippman, former judge of the Indiana Court of Appeals will lecture on Preservation of the Record for Appeal and will make general comments on Appellate Advocacy.

Wednesday March 31:
International Law Society Presentation.

Within the past two weeks, the telephone in the lounge has been stolen twice by persons unknown. Following the first theft, Dean Farago donated an extra phone to replace the missing one. This second phone now has also been taken, sometime between the evening of March 1 and the next morning. There are no extra phones to replace it.

At the meeting of March 2, the SBA agreed to purchase a new, wall-mounted phone. It also unanimously passed a motion "warning that the person(s) responsible for the thefts, if discovered, will be prosecuted if the telephones are not returned by March 22." In addition, the Executive Board encourages all persons with information regarding this matter to disclose it to any Board member. Their names will be kept confidential.

Corporate Accountability Symposium

co-sponsored by Delta Theta Phi and ABA/LSD

Friday March 26--Debate and Reception

MARK GREEN, noted consumer advocate, lobbyist, Congressional watchdog and former Nader's Raider will debate Corporate Accountability

Delta Theta Phi Faculty Roast

Friday, April 2 at 7:00 p.m. IAM Union Hall

Come and see Marcia and Ivan get Broiled by Burn 'em Bruce and others

LAW WEEK CALENDAR

On March 4th, PAD is sponsoring a panel discussion on the exclusionary rule. Panelists will include Prof. Bruce Berner and Judge James Letsinger of the Lake Superior Court, and Dean Ehren, as moderator, will lead the discussion. The discussion will begin at 7:00pm in the student union, with a reception following the program.

Friday March 26:
DTP Symposium - "Corporate Accountability." Mark Green, who ran the largest consumer lobby in Washington, D.C., is the author of the Corporate Democracy Act. He is scheduled to debate Larry Curtis of Firestone. Mr. Curtis was involved in the "Firestone 600" litigation. Reception to follow.

Monday March 29:
WLSA Presentation - Employment discrimination.

Tuesday March 30:
DTP - At 9 am in the Courtroom, Eugene G. Chippman, former judge of the Indiana Court of Appeals will lecture on Preservation of the Record for Appeal and will make general comments on Appellate Advocacy.

Wednesday March 31:
International Law Society Presentation.

CALL

NOW IS THE TIME FOR DECISION!

FIRST TRAVEL CENTER

FOR PLANE RESERVATIONS - to all areas of the United States and all international destinations.

DON'T PROcrastinate! Reserve in advance and save on airline special fares!

TRAIN TRAVEL - Request an "rw 40" Save money! Yes! Let us decode for you.

HOTEL* MOTEL* AND RESORT RESERVATIONS - Sheer luxury to penny-pinching inns.

CRUISES - Sail on a Love Boat or canoe on the Amazon!

CAR RENTAL - Wagons, Vans, Sub-Sub Comacts or Cadillacs.

GROUP TRAVEL - travel together for discounts!

ALSO - Polar Bear Watching, Trekking the Himalayas, "Earthwatch" expeditions, Skiing, Whale Watching, Galapagos Island Trips, Kayaking in the Arctic...

TOLL FREE - 926-7691

219 S. Calumet, Chesterton IN 46304
By Sally Schall

John Farago has more than a wide array of credentials, experience, and administration and a fondness for twinkies - he has a commitment to Valparaiso where he has an interest in the Deanship. In a recent Special Sections article, he described Valparaiso's attributes as including "a collection of people who are interested in the context for learning that is intimate and caring." He said, "It is hard to see how this project could be any more far fetched than another mainstream law school."

In talking about funding efforts for the new law building, Farago said that he is not after a grandiose project of any big checks. He believes, "We need senior faculty members to help with the fundraising. That is not to say it is essential to convey to supporters and alums that we are making the small size and unique values. He does not think the new building will lock Valski why he thinking it would be to size increases in the future, and that the new building will be almost date from 350-450 students. The planned facilities would be luxurious for any law school.

Farago stressed that his experience as Associate Dean and Assistant Professor of Law at Valparaiso Uni bring about. He stressed that the community to become very familiar with the administration and day-to-day operations of the school. He believes there are "wounds to heal here," and that completing the project is "our\". He has trusted others. Rumors travel so smoothly that we assume the truth. Various people have asked me, "Why are you doing this?" Students asked Farago to describe qualities he might bring to the job. He said, "If you're asking me whether I'd be a good Dean, the answer is no. But I have tremendous respect for him. My years as Dean of Wesleyan have been my best and most productive." Farago said he has learned a lot during the process of doing just that, that may be a knowledge of "middle qualities he might bring to the job. It involves administrating, problem solving, or understanding the workings of placement procedures, negotiating contracts, and working with collections. Farago didn't offer an equivalent numerical grade for himself in the process.

Farago believes that he can utilize existing structures while furthering the school's mission. He said, "It is too early to know if we can raise the bar on the school's mission. We have set goals, and have an incredibly good reputation," as he stated.

Farago would be reluctant to make major changes in a curriculum he believes is favorable comparable to that of the new law school. "We are the second smallest private law school in the country. The Dual Degree student body helps to support a large elective capacity." He points to our improving bar exam scores, statewide property sequence as strengths, adding that the bar law sequence is as good as at any other school. "We are the only 2L degree. Valparaiso is also "very deep in the jurisprudence offerings".

Farago said that he would work to preserve the existing strengths of Valparaiso, while bringing in new elements. He envisions a "supermarket" of courses, some type of regular student-faculty interaction, and a flexible structure of institutional alcoholic indulgence, like cheese and sherry once a month, "presumably not limited to alcoholic beverages! Farago said "tea and Danish" turned into "Brie and sherry" at Harvard Law School where the regular student-faculty get-together was known that "Cambridge shopping bag ladies" began attending and filling these glasses. "It's a waste of time (cheese didn't keep that well!). In addition, "We have to hang together", no matter who is chosen Dean. "We have to care for each other, talking and reviewing decisions with each other. I'm wearing a triple hat here - I'm a teacher, an administrator, and a fundraiser. I'm supposed to convince you that I am a great Dean, but I would not forget my other hats in trying to show you the latter." He might not be able to teach, but his "Second, the job of Dean at Valparaiso is sensible part of a law school's mission. It involves administrating, problem solving, and working with collections. Farago didn't offer an equivalent numerical grade for himself in the process." He said he would not consider himself as "the same person as the current Dean."

In response to questions about the university Board of Directors' participation in the planning phase, Farago said, "The university Board of Directors was the first group to visit the site, and they were granted by Wesemann Hall. However, a new plan was decided to build a new school rather than add onto Wesemann Hall for a larger library, 8 classrooms ranging in size from 20 seats to 75 seats, larger administrative offices, and the clinic to be located within the law school. The outside design would comport with the function of the building and beings. In addition, rather than building a whole floor, smaller lots would be located in the vicinity of the law school. The SBA got to the student representation on the Planning Task Force. However, Professor Brockington inquired about the possibility of finalization (following a significant amount of discussion) of the student representation on the Planning Task Force. Professor Kindred is a member."

"If anyone has reactions or opinions to these plans, please let Professor Brockington or SBA members know." Form a Supreme Court Justice, Goldberg would be at the Law Day Luncheon on Friday, April 2, 1982, Saturday, April 3rd, will be our annual Barrister's Ball at the Serbian Hall in Hobart. The cost of the ticket for the Luncheon is $6.50, and for the Ball are $9.00 with an extra charge for dress.

Rep. Clark is going to contact the Physical Plant concerning the installa- tion of the new kitchen at the student lounge. They will be held the Wednesday and Thursday, March 24th and 25th, after we get back from spring break. Professor Kindred has indicated that he would increase the law students contact with the alumni by asking the Alumni Board to consider the SBA President on it as an ex-officio member.

The university has agreed to place some sort of designation of our status as law students on our identification cards beginning next fall. Now everyone will know who we are.
March 4, 1982

THE FORUM

Dear 3rd Year:
Why doesn't this law school teach courses in American Indian Law or in Sado-Masochism?
Signed, Marlon Brando

Dear Marlon:
As for your first question, the law school does not teach any course in American Indian Law because the school has no classes specifically entitled Sado-Masochism, law students experience this relationship every day. For example, the students who took Evidence and the ones who presently have Public Law are quite adept at the fundamentals and workings of S/M. (I was going to mention Prof. Hiller's tax break). Now Joe is a student no mol. But received 65's;

Dear 3rd Year:
It was sorry to hear that many students failed the make the grade last semester and were asked not to return to the honor of their memory, I have composed the following limerick:
An eager young lad named Joe: Gave Valpo Law School a go; He tried and he tried; But received 65's; Now Joe is a student no mo!
Signed, 7501

Dear 3rd Year:
Your sincerity and compassion overwhelms me. If you don't make it as an attorney or a writer, you can always become a mortician.
Signed, Dan and Dick, U.S. Reps.

Dear Dan and Dick:
Aren't word processors wonderful? You don't have to be in the courtroom to ask the ever-dignified Mr. Bob and Doug about a specimen of male pulchitrude who is chatting with a female pulchitrude. You do have to ask him about his coining the phrase "cavalier dicta". Terry reminds herself to use those words in her first Supreme Court brief, which will undoubtedly be submitted after Mr. Scionti ascends to the position of chief Justice. "I hope that they put Kevin and Bill Rehnquist at opposite ends of the bench," Terry muses.

Who could forget the day when Paul heard about Valparaiso's new law school, before he became the first student to receive a hearty round of applause from his classmates for his "I was there" rendition of the Dayton school desegregation case? Classes are so much more relevant when they have that personal touch.

Extra-curricular activities were even more up-to-date than classroom events. Many a beer was quaffed during the hectic first-year days; which seemed to spill over into the second as many a cadet carried students into the third year days. Terry shakes her head as she recalls the other times, in the midst of the hostage crisis in Iran when a group of more than slightly inebriated first-year students of Mexican heritage put Kevin and Bill Rehnquist in their place; they put Kevin and Bill Rehnquist in their place;

Countless memories flood Terry's mind. She sits for hours as they come flooding back. She remembers the after-supper, some embarrassing and some just plain infuriating. She snaps back to reality and discovers her noctiluca moving alone in the lounge. Her friends have disappeared, believing that she is in a Twinkie trance. She pulls up her holey socks and picks up her tacky, but sturdy, backpocket and trudges up the stairs. As she proceeds down the corridor to the courtroom, she realizes that a briefcase and a tailored suit will signal progress toward a long-term goal, but it will involve sacrificing some security. Terry sighs and walks into class late, just for old-times sake.

(Continued on page 48)
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